(10)

THE DOCTOR'S DUTY TO THE STATE

JOHN B. ROBERTS



THE DOCTOR'S DUTY TO THE STATE

ESSAYS

ON

The Public Relations of Physicians

BY

JOHN B. ROBERTS, A.M., M.D.

Member of the Committee on Legislation of the American Medical Association

CHICAGO

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION PRESS

1908

CONTENTS

PAGE

The Doctor's Duty to the State 9
The Address of the President of the American Academy of Medicine, 1904.

The Political Side of Medicine..... 32
The American Academy of Medicine, 1902.

The Doctor's Fee—A Plea for Honorable Dealing.. 45
The Philadelphia County Medical Society, 1901.

Professional Responsibility in Accident Cases Involving Litigation 60
The Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania, 1904.

The Necessity of Membership in County Medical Societies 63
Pennsylvania Medical Journal, 1904.

The Need of Common Sense in Medical Practice.. 70
Address to Graduating Class of Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, 1892.

The Necessity for Physicians' Aid Associations.... 79
Philadelphia County Medical Society, 1891.

A Breach of Trust—The Physician's Use of Secret Remedies 84
Philadelphia Branch of American Pharmaceutical Association, 1907.

Some Causes of Inefficiency in Medical Practice... 87
The Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania, 1906.

The Needs of This Hour 92
An Address at a Citizens' Meeting in Philadelphia, on Dec. 19, 1904.

The Real Cause of Municipal Corruption 96
The National Municipal League, April 27, 1905.

The Hopelessness of Honest Elections in Philadelphia Under the Present Laws and with the Present Courts 103
Letter to Philadelphia Public Ledger, February 9, 1904.



PREFACE.

These papers, advocating a more active participation in public affairs by physicians than has been the custom in this country, are reprinted with the belief that such broader activity on the part of my colleagues will help to free the State from many present evils. A good doctor must be educated, honest, sensible and brave. Nothing more is needed in its citizens to make a state great.

JOHN B. ROBERTS.

313 S. 17th St., Philadelphia.
March 1, 1908.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

https://archive.org/details/b22480456



THE DOCTOR'S DUTY TO THE STATE.

The doctor's highest duty is to be honest and to fight for honesty in his profession and in the state. He should abhor cowardice in others, as in himself, for cowardice is the parent of dishonesty. The professional coward and the commercial coward have aided efficiently, if perchance unwittingly, the present degradation of the body politic and the body medical. Moral cowardice is a characteristic of both corporations and individuals in this twentieth century, and is the result of the worship of the "Almighty Dollar," which has usurped the place of "Self-Respect" in men's minds.

The sociologic character of the work of this Academy and its educational requirement for fellowship authorize the introduction here of topics of an economic, or politico-social, nature. No excuse need therefore be made for my choice of subject. To those who may object to the criticisms of my profession, my city or my state, I reply that I know of no better way to remedy evils than to recognize their existence. An honest and just investigation of suspected corruption and an honest and brave avowal of discovered wrong are the first steps toward amelioration of evil. He, who is afraid to see, and dare not mention, the misdoings of himself and his colleagues, is his profession's worst son. He, who cries out for concealment under the plea of loyalty, is no better than the scheming political leader, whose cow-

ardice and insincerity call forth the reprobation of upright citizens. It needs no argument to prove that cowardice begets lying and that a liar is essentially a coward. Reformation comes from honest introspection, which begets respect and honor from the outside world.

David's description of a citizen of Zion is "he that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and speaketh the truth in his heart." The upright gait, the righteous labor and the truthful spirit are as needful now as in the times of that great King.

The superior training of doctors of medicine, their unusual opportunities to know the needs of a community, their wide acquaintance with citizens, their many chances to play the part of missionary, and their personal influence with active men make their responsibility to the state great. Even greater is the responsibility, and greater is the duty, that rests upon a fellow of this Academy, because its claim to existence is founded upon a broad cultivation of the humanities, in addition to medical education.

The doctor is excused from jury duty and is entitled to withhold medical confidences under certain circumstances. He should, therefore, be willing to render a return for these privileges in a higher civic courage and usefulness. It is not only his religious or ethical duty to be honest and brave, but his civic duty as well. In these days, moreover, a mere passive virtue is not sufficient.

The doctor must fight for honesty in others also and strike real knock-down blows at political and professional chicanery, if he wishes to do his whole duty to the public. There are in all vocations weaklings who do nothing but accept the benefits which their environment brings them. They make no return to their generation and when dead leave no special vacancy in the economic household. Such impassive units are of little real

worth. Although they may do no aetive harm, they inerease the dead-weight of indifferenee, whieh must be lifted, if the righteousness of the world is to inerease and the happiness of humanity to be brought to its fulfilment. It has always been this inertia that has retarded progress, and permitted wrong to flourish.

The physieian should be on guard lest in eivic matters he beeome tainted with this form of inert eonservatism. It is easy to plead professional engagements and personal modesty as exeuses for lack of energy in uprooting hygienie and politieal evils.

A physieian does not do his duty to his fellow eitizens by merely treating their typhoid fevers, while making no effort to eompel the loeal rulers to supply purer drinking water to the home. He knows the eause of this disease, and it is his bounden duty to aetively labor for a pure water supply. Similar aetivity in urging measures to prevent the spread of smallpox and other eontagious diseases is a reeognized part of his professional work. The doctor may not eseape this responsibility, beeause his sluggish temperament and unused eonseienee permit him to see with equanimity ignorant men and innoeent ehildren suffer and die. If he is mentally or physieally lazy, let him seleet some position in the world, where sueh inaetivity and uselessness are less eensurable.

Some may exelaim that these matters are not the business of the praetising physieian, but belong to the eivie offieials. Sueh exeuses for derelietion of eivie and professional duty should always arouse aetive eondemnation. The doetor knows the results of seientifie study of hygienie questions and should insist upon their applieation to the eitizen's person and possessions. A member of a eommunity, who is favored by edueation, experienee and soeial position, owes more to the eommon good than one less fortunate in these attributes. The

more one has, the more one owes to his fellows. Let us all accept the responsibility of our profession, if we accept its honors and emoluments.

This claim upon the doctor is individual and may not be shirked. To delay for societies, institutions or combinations of men to make the start is not justifiable. A brave knight goes to battle alone. He does not wait for companions to give him courage and afford succor. Delay often means failure. Prompt action often gives the only possible success. After all, history shows that organized bodies follow a single brave spirit. The great reforms have always been started by the alert brain or agile body of one man. He, who works for the love of the duty to be done, soon finds followers. He who tremblingly waits for company in good deeds has a sorry achievement to his credit. The one-man fights for righteousness have made the modern better than the ancient world.

Much unpaid work is to be done on this earth. I like to think that a great deal of it is done by doctors. The public knows that physicians do much for the sick without money recompense. Much is to be done in civic affairs, which brings no reward and no glory. This is just as much the doctor's duty as to cure the poor and friendless, or to ease their road to the grave.

How often financial success blunts the conscience and lessens the activity of medical men! What a misconception of duty this! The less one has to think of the necessities of his wife and children, the more free is he to devote his energies to the public service. It is often pretty easy to pardon the impecunious man, who for his household's sake is driven to accept a "dirty dollar" for some improper service to a sly tempter. No excuse seems adequate, however, when a similar dereliction is committed by a physician of means, education and intelligence. His brains and intellectual training should

show him the true path, which may be invisible to his muddlepated colleague. The absence of financial stress makes his failure to do the right inexcusable. It is unreasonable to expect us all to be measured by the same standard of ethics or morals. The fellows of this Academy, for instance, are rightly expected to do better and be better, than men of less intellectual opportunity. So also, those of means, whether professional men or business men, should be held to a stricter ethical responsibility than those who have a daily struggle to feed their children. In the abstract, right is right, wrong is wrong and duty is duty, without regard to collateral circumstances; but I cannot bring myself to believe that so much is to be expected from the naturally weak and accidentally fettered, as from those who are strong and free. Strength and freedom give power; and power always brings responsibility. This is the reason that I urge our 800 fellows to consider the doctor's duty to the state.

In my city the business men will not work to free the state from the political ills that affect it; and I therefore call thus earnestly for political deliverance at the hands of the doctors. The attitude of indifference to election frauds, legislative corruption and police blackmail, on the part of the business community, is easily intelligible to students of economic conditions. Much of the bribery in council chambers and legislative assemblies is the direct result of business competition. A railroad or a hospital desires to obtain a franchise, a grant of land, or an appropriation, to make it more prosperous than its competitor or rival. Its directors, believing that the end justifies the means, ignore the principles of ethics, because it is success that appeals to them, and bribe the men who vote, with cash from the treasury of the corporation, or, even worse, give them a rake-off of 10 per cent. from the appropriation obtained from the public

coffers. Many illustrations of this kind of bribery and robbery are familiarly discussed in our daily contact with society. Yet the directors, who permit this thing to be done, pose as good citizens and expect us to greet them with deference and respect.

It is not difficult to understand the hold on these same directors, which the political bosses have, when they desire to raise a large corruption fund to pay for illegal voters and repeaters on election day. It is not surprising that such contemptible citizens and successful directors pay blackmail to both the larger political parties. Are they any better or any worse than the carter who gives the policeman $10 to permit his cart to obstruct the public highway, night after night, to save stable rent; or the brothel-keeper, who pays a monthly stipend to the police captain, to be undisturbed in her trade?

The managers of the great corporations are the chief causes of civic corruption. I have some respect for the ignorant dwellers in the tenements and alleys, who obey the ward leaders, probably their only friends in time of sickness, and accept for their vote a drink of whisky, a silver coin or a bag of flour. Their subservience has at least the flavor of gratitude. The business man with full bank account, cultivated surroundings and clear insight, who allows his legislative agent to bribe members of council, assembly or congress, with money, stock or unworthy patronage, deserves the contempt of true men. It is no valid excuse to plead that these things are done, without his knowledge, by the executive officers of his railroad or institution. If he be a director, let him take the responsibility, as well as the honor, pertaining to his position, and prevent such acts on the part of the subordinates. Shifting responsibility may quiet his uneasy, though feeble, conscience, but it does not lessen the contempt felt by others for such unworthy citizenship.

It is not fair to suggest that cases of this kind are found only among business men, and that the liberal professions are free from this political taint. The law and the elergy doubtless have their unworthy followers. That the medical profession has not suceeeded in keeping all sueh evil praetices out of its ranks is known too well. The promoters and trustees of some medieal sehools and hospitals are not a whit behind railroad and telephone magnates in sedueing the politieal leaders to appropriate publie funds for private use. Some of us have seen the eoarsest forms of politieal triekery invade even medieal organizations, with which no laymen are eonneeted.

These illustrations serve to eonfirm the belief that human nature is the same in all avoeations. They impel us to use diligenee to discover and fight the unworthy ones in our midst, who thus degrade the whole profession by failing to recognize their duty to the state.

You may think these general statements made by reason of perusal of sensational newspapers. I assure you that I. as an eleetion offieial, have personal knowledge of politieal eorruption of the worst kind in the Eighth Ward of Philadelphia. My testimony under oath to the Court of Common Pleas has shown that I know something of the topic of whieh I am now speaking. My interest in professional organizations and in sociologieal studies has enabled me to see many things bearing on the relations of medical men to each other and to the state. Knowledge thus obtained makes me ashamed of some of my fellow doetors as well as of some of my fellow eitizens in business walks. Men, desirous of seeing munieipal government free from fraud and bribery, send generous eontributions for that end with the condition that their names be kept unknown. Others decline to allow their names to be used publiely, lest the political maehine interfere with their private

business. The honest eitizen in Philadelphia to-day is held in bondage as eomplete as that of the negro of the Southern States in 1861.

This cowardice of business men and even of the judges, is seareely to be wondered at when the condition of affairs is examined. A four-story residence, with a brown stone front, on a lot 23 feet by 175 feet, situated on Walnut Street, is assessed at $60,000, while a four-story residenee, with a red stone and briek front, on a lot only 22 feet by 125 feet, and with mueh less back-building, situated in the same square of Walnut Street, is assessed at $65,000. Every intelligent man one meets will say, "That's easy to understand. The first belongs to Governor B., the other to Dr. A."

The guilty eleetion offieers of the fifth division of the Eighth Ward are allowed to pursue eleetion frauds undisturbed for months after three judges have heard from a reputable citizen sworn testimony of their eorrupt praetiees. Proprietors of disorderly houses easily obtain straw bail. Our friends point out to us "speakeasies," where liquor is illegally sold, eonçerning whieh the poliee apparently have no knowledge.

Upright eitizens are ashamed of the machine-made judges, who seem in cases of a political charaeter to strain every nerve to find technical quibbles in favor of the aeeused, with the result that justiee to the state is praetically impossible. Is not this due to the fact that judges know that their tenure of offiee depends on obedienee to the politieal machine? This same maehine it is that ereates the eourts, selects the judges, pieks out officials which the judges subserviently appoint, and raises the judge's salaries after they have been "good." These things are now so notorious that it is the judge, who fails of renomination, whom the eommunity honors. His rejeetion by the maehine is an evidence that he has been a eourageous and faithful judge. His retention

would mean that he had made himself "solid" with the political bosses, who control the machine and who expect favors at his hands.

The public has not failed to observe that political cases, in which there is a reasonable general belief that the accused is guilty, are often tried before judges whose recent political affiliations make them possibly amenable to pressure at the machine's hands. Have the people not been surprised more than once at the rulings of the judge in favor of the accused politician?

It does not conduce to honesty in the young to see one of the Middle States represented in the United States Senate by a man, who seemingly escaped punishment, when on trial for illegal use of the state's money, only because the acts were done so long ago that the evidence must be ruled out. It needs the doctors and all citizens to cry out for public honesty, when a Western State is now represented in the United States senate by a senator who is serving a term in jail! How can we expect Philadelphia boys to believe in decency when one of its wards has been repeatedly represented in the state legislature by a man who was the backer, if not in part a proprietor, of a bawdy house?

It is time for physicians to wake up and in a body insist upon that public honesty and decency, which the business men, the lawyers, and the clergymen seem afraid to demand from the rulers of the cities, in which we live. Business men are the main bribers of politicians and the greatest buyers of legislation. They are, therefore, the chief elements in the political corruption of the day. They are worse traitors to the country than the politicians, who accept the bribes and deliver the franchises and other legislative privileges, for they often pose as "respectable citizens." Their hypocrisy is used to cover ill deeds.

A blunt and fearless political boss, who boldly robs the public in the manner of a highwayman, is less to be despised than the sneaking business man who, through his legislative agents, secretly pays the boss to rob the people, while he himself wears a sanctimonious face and is "shocked" at the prevailing corruption. The insincerity and dishonesty of a large contingent of the business world make one feel that the chief satisfaction in human intercourse is to be found in association with little children, whose straightforward honesty is proverbial.

Nothing impresses the unthinking world so much as success, and nowadays money-making and money-having seem to cover many forms of dishonesty. It has recently been delightful to see the faith of business men and financiers in successful politicians rewarded by great losses of money. So long as these politicians amassed wealth by robbing only the city and state, their compatriots in business respected, trusted and even bowed down to them. This unreasoning mental attitude recently gave fine opportunity for the same political schemers to unload worthless securities on their financial acquaintances. Many men have now learned the needed lesson that a public thief will become a private thief, if he only have opportunity and a reasonable assurance of escape from punishment. A business man recently said that it was his opinion that a large proportion of men in business were honest only because it paid. So long as honesty is required, many men will be honest; so soon as business furnishes the same opportunity for unpunished fraud as does politics, men in all walks of life will emulate our political bosses in knavery, robbery and blackmail.

The doctor, by being honest in his dealings with his patients, can do much to raise the public standard of truthfulness, and thus serve the state. It is a common

belief that doctors are inclined to tell untruths in order to save the sensibilities of their patients. This practice does unfortunately seem to be not uncommon among a certain kind of doctors; but it does not represent the real spirit of our profession. A patient who has once been deceived by a doctor's lies, is not apt to put much faith in his subsequent statements. Dr. Cabot, of Boston, wrote an important article on this subject a few years ago. His advocacy of truth and his belief that truthfulness is the best policy deserve high praise.

When one places the life of his wife, his child or himself in the hands of a physician, he has a right to expect honesty and truthfulness in the man so honored. I have no patience with dishonest doctors, who expect success and respect at the hands of their patients, and yet treat them with secret nostrums of unknown strength, deceive them with false words, and allow them to dictate the methods of treatment. If a doctor can not induce his patient to do what is proper in treatment, he has no right to temporize and follow the patient's desires rather than what he knows to be the only right line of treatment. It is much more honest to say to the unbelieving and contemptuous sick man, "If I have the responsibility, I must have the control. You must get some other doctor, if you will not obey me."

It is no wonder that many patients treat physicians with little consideration and respect. The unscientific methods, careless attention to details, and weak conduct of many doctors are enough to make the public fly to osteopaths, Christian scientists and other quacks, who seem to at least have the virtues of believing in their own nonsense. A weak-kneed, wobbly-minded doctor can not expect to arouse sentiments of confidence; he is necessarily doomed to a life of professional failure.

An honest physician need not be as blunt as a boor, but he must be forceful, truthful, confident and self-

respecting. It will not take long for the local public to recognize the work of such a man as a citizen and the young will grow up to respect and emulate him in civic value. This is part of the doctor's duty to the state.

The doctor should teach the laity that mental hygiene, or discipline, is as essential to proper living and happiness as physical hygiene. The theologians for centuries taught us to train the spirit to save the soul, while the physicians laid too much stress perhaps on the physical side of human nature. It is now seen that the mutual relations of a sound mind and a sound body are of primary importance in the saving of the soul as well as in saving the body. Hygiene of the body gives a spirit of religious toleration and calm, and fits man for the next world as well as for this. So also hygiene of the mind gives a healthy digestion and a good income-making body and fits man for this world as well as the next. Many of the mental and physical wrecks in our homes and hospitals, which may truly be said to be "possessed of a devil" would have been useful members of the body social, had they had proper mental culture from childhood. Such control must be obtained by psychic gymnastics, instituted by parents during the early years of childhood. Nervous children are the get of nervous households. It should be as disgraceful to be called "nervous" as to be called "bandy-legged" or "cock-eyed." If parents would practice self-control, their children would emulate this virtue, just as well-shaped athletic parents have children, who aspire to their parents' physical beauty and prowess.

It is the doctor's duty to teach the state's inhabitants this fact, and not encourage hysteria, neurasthenia, and general "cantankerousness" by foolish sympathy, unwise talk or ignoraut diagnoses of "railway spine." Many wrecked lives and useless citizens are made by unwise advice given by doctors, into whose hands persons with

slight injuries first fall for treatment. Many damage suits could be avoided with justice to the injured and to the agents responsible for the injury, if all doctors realized the importance of mental control. Many "railway spines" and traumatic neuroses are caused by the doctor's unscientific and unreasoning sympathy.

The doctor's duty to the state includes instruction to his patients in mental hygiene, and the prevention of unnecessary litigation. It is easy to develop a neurasthenic crank out of a patient, who has received an insignificant injury, and it is easy to make a hysterical valetudinarian out of a useful citizen by magnifying his dangers and feeding his imagination with depressing possibilities. It is the doctor's public duty to see that such sad occurrences do not result from his maladroitness.

Instances could easily be given to prove this contention. Take as an example a railroad company that was in my opinion practically robbed of between $15,000 and $20,000 for an insignificant injury, which ought not to have brought to the patient more than a few hundred dollars at the very most. I recollect well a firm that was forced to pay $5,000 or $6,000 for an injury to an employé, which was of comparatively little moment. The woman when brought into court after months of delay was a neurasthenic wreck, due not to the injury but to injudicious friends, lawyer, and perhaps doctors. A prompt settlement of the claim, which in justice to all should have been by a small amount of money, would have saved the girl's health. What can the worried and distressed patient do, if the doctor does not protect her from her own family's anxiety and cupidity and the lawyer's greed? The doubtful professional character of lawyers' contingent fees in damage suits should be affirmed by good citizens. It requires an unusually honest man, be he lawyer or

doctor, to resist the temptation to magnify the patient's suffering when his own pay depends on the jury's verdict.

In connection with the same topic may be mentioned the wrong done to the public by what may be called "alarmist" practitioners. Some doctors make such a "mountain" out of a "mole-hill" of illness that they become known to their professional colleagues and even to their patients and their patients' friends as those who perpetually cry "wolf, wolf," when there is no "wolf." This conduct is partly due to narrowness of professional experience, partly to temperament, but the laity often attribute it to a desire to scare the patient into a mental attitude, which will allow frequent visits and large bills. With all deference to the specialties, I can not help feeling that the limited outlook, which special practice furnishes, contributes to this evil as much perhaps as real ignorance of etiology, symptomatology, therapeusis and prognosis.

A graduate, who has become a specialist a few months after commencement day, may with perfect truthfulness on his part assert that a furuncle of the auricle, a follicular tonsillitis, a foreign body in the cornea, a bean in the nose, or a small crop of herpes over one of the ribs is a serious condition demanding rest in bed, a trained nurse at $20 per week, and daily visits at $5 per visit. His assertion is, however, as untrue, in the majority of cases as the statement of the ignoramus who calls a febrile attack due to indigestion a case of typhoid fever, and says that it was aborted in three days by his treatment.

Even specialists of eminence are not free from this injustice to the public, which keeps patients unnecessarily from business, depleting their pocket-books, and adding to the anxiety of their households. It is in some cases a pardonable error, for to examine for years only

eyes, or ears, or throats, or skin must make a doctor's horizon as small as that of the old-fashioned dentist, whose profession was much more that of a mechanic than a physician. Recent years have fortunately given the state specialists in dentistry and other departments of medicine, who know the collateral branches of the healing art. The general surgeon and physician too are now learning the necessity of at least some working knowledge of the specialist's science and art.

An important duty of the doctor is to support the present state supervision of medical practice. The various state laws governing medical licensure are far from perfect, but they result in much better protection of the citizen than did the commercial medical schools of ten or twenty years ago. Many of you remember the struggle to wrest from medical teachers the power to create medical practitioners with almost no real knowledge of medicine. The medical schools of that day were, in many instances, conducted merely as money-makers for the professors. The chief output was a crop of half-educated men with a moderate knowledge of the art of medicine, but almost none of medical science.

It is gratifying to remember that it was the medical profession itself, which ended this system by obtaining laws to give state boards of medical examiners control of the entrance to medical practice. Now, the medical schools educate, but the states, through their respective examining boards, fix the standard of education and control the license to practice. It is the duty of the doctor as a citizen to strengthen the hands of these boards, because they give the public an opportunity to know which physicians have sufficient education to render them likely to be safe practitioners.

It is undoubtedly possible for a man to pass the examinations of a board, and yet be a dangerous practitioner, either because of his rascality or his lack of common

sense. Still, this menace to the public safety is infinitely less than was the case when students entered medical college ignorant of the common school branches, attended two five-month courses of lectures, and were given the medical degree after a farcical examination, conducted by the teachers whose income depended upon the size of their classes. In those days a considerable number of students deliberately selected the medical schools known to have the easiest examinations.

The present system of state license is a hardship, when a doctor removes from one state to another, and the demand for reciprocity in medical licensure is therefore reasonable. Even this defect in the method of protecting the public from medical ignorance, however, is inconsequential, when compared with the evils of the former system of commercial college control of medical practice.

Fellows of this academy were active in the campaign to destroy low-grade medical schools, by the establishment of state examinations, and that work has been pretty satisfactorily accomplished. Professors, who fought the enactment of laws to protect the public from their ignorant pupils, still probably evade the law when possible, or perchance endeavor to bring political pressure to bear on the examiners. I have known political pressure to be exerted to influence medical examiners to pass unqualified men; but, in the instances with which I am acquainted, the bravery and honesty of a few doctors frustrated the scheme.

These facts show why it is the doctor's duty to the state to support the medical examining boards, to work to have honest men appointed upon them, and not to be too censorious of their short-comings. We who have not served on these boards, know little of the worry, the work and the weariness entailed by honest service in them. The man, who unreasonably or unjustly

decries the system and its exponents, is doing an economic wrong similar to that of those few honorable but short-sighted doctors, who for years played into the hands of the profession's enemies by opposing state control of medical licensure.

The manner, in which state laws compelled low-grade medical colleges to adopt entrance examinations, lengthen terms, and exact efficient final examinations, has fully justified the prophecies of the advocates of state control.

It is difficult to understand the mental quality of an educated physician, who believes that he is acting honestly toward his patients, when he accepts his therapeutic teaching from the advertisements of secret remedies and writes his prescriptions after consultation with the drummer of a drug firm. I formerly supposed that the sale of large quantities of these secret medicines was due to their use by ignorant physicians who had graduated from low-grade medical schools. Careful observation has convinced me of the error of this view. Some years ago, I read in a cyclopædic work on one of the specialties an elaborate article by one of my hospital colleagues, in which "A————" was suggested in the treatment of a certain disease. I saw recently a letter written by a professor in a great University Medical School, in which he advised that a patient, whom I had referred to him, be given "P————." Not very long ago, I heard a metropolitan professor of surgery discant on the value of "H———;" and about a year since one of my patients told me that she had been advised to take "M————" by a hospital physician of Philadelphia. These facts suffice to show that intelligent physicians, and even teachers, have been led into the illegitimate practice of treating patients with remedies of whose composition they are ignorant.

It is clearly improper for a doctor to prescribe a cer-

tain remedy for a patient, when he does not know, and is not permitted to find out, the character and the amount of the powerful drugs it contains. It is also, in my opinion, detrimental to professional integrity for medical journals, conducted under professional auspices, to accept advertisements of pharmaceutical products of secret composition.

Both of these questions have been vigorously discussed in medical circles during recent years. As to the first proposition there can be but one answer, which is that a doctor has no right to use a powerful therapeutic weapon, unless he knows its possibilities for good and evil. These possibilities he can not know unless he is able to learn how much acetanilid, strychnin, arsenic, mercury or other active ingedients it contains. The propriety of medical journals, published by doctors, increasing the dangerous use of these secret remedies by accepting their advertisements can not be successfully maintained. In a discussion among some officers of a medical journal, a distinguished professor of medicine once said: "Other journals take them, why shouldn't our journal?" The reply to this query is: "Some doctors accept commissions for steering patients to operating specialists, why not we also?" If the vice of prescribing medicines of unknown composition is to be rooted out, honest doctors must jointly repudiate any such illicit combination with commercial journalism, and individually refuse to prescribe remedies of whose composition they are kept in ignorance.

It is said that in Japan the importation of secret proprietary medicines containing a poison, from which accidents might result, is absolutely prohibited, and that the retailer must be informed as to the ingredients, proportions and doses. (*American Medicine*, May 9, 1903, from *Canadian Journal of Medicine and Surgery.*) Such a law would render valuable service to the public

of America. Osler in an address before the Canadian Medical Association in 1902, spoke of these nostrums being "foisted on the profession by men who trade on the innocent credulity of the regular physician, quite as much as any quack preys on the gullible public." It must be a very ignorant or dishonest doctor, and not an innocent credulous one, who treats his patients with the secret nostrums brought to his notice by interested salesmen.

Such a travesty of medical science deserves the condemnation of every honest doctor. It is the duty of every honest consultant to express his adverse opinion, when such course of treatment is suggested in the consultation room. It may be true that men of distinction use remedies of unknown composition; it may be true that medical journals, owned by doctors or by great medical schools and organizations, accept advertisements of these abominations; but such conduct only serves to show to what degradation a lax ethical spirit may bring even those whom we would like to respect.

The secret-remedy evil is degrading the medical faculty at this hour very much as the low-grade medical school debauched the profession two or three decades ago. The cause is the same—laziness and love of money. The cure is the same—an aroused professional sentiment. It was the leaven of honesty in the hearts of the doctors at large, which compelled avaricious professors and low-grade medical schools to cease deluging the public with unsafe and ignorant medical practitioners. It took energy, courage and unselfishness to carry on the work. Honest men were compelled to antagonize friends, to fight against their *almæ matres,* to relinquish opportunity of professorial position, and to be misunderstood by other honest men. What matter, when the goal was to preserve the state and uphold the honor of the medical guild!

You and I have now a similar, but mightier, task. Then we fought colleges with self-satisfied faculties and thousands of dollars invested in teaching plants. Now, we have to battle against professional dishonesty, therapeutic credulity, and millions of dollars invested in the manufacture of secret nostrums by quick-witted business men.

The task is made more difficult by the fact that a very large number of these vaunted remedies and foods owe their popularity to the alcohol they contain. Dr. Charles Harrington made, a few years ago, a chemical analysis of many of these products. His paper (*Boston Medical and Surgical Journal*, March 12, 1903, quoted in *American Medicine*, March 21, 1903, p. 469) showed that one of these foods contained in volume 23.03 per cent. of alcohol, another 10.60 per cent., another 14.81 per cent., another 15.81 per cent., another 15.58 per cent., another 18.95 per cent., and another 19.72 per cent. He found the nutriment contained in the maximum daily amount, which was recommended of these so-called foods, was only 1.25 ounces, but the contained amount of alcohol was equivalent to six ounces of whisky.

A much advertised remedy was found by the Massachusetts State Board of Health to contain 23.46 per cent. by weight of alcohol, another 15.33 per cent., another 16.77 per cent., and another 5.87 per cent. The New York *Evening Post* (quoted by *American Medicine*, March 21, 1903) mentions a "tonic" which contained 41.6 per cent. of alcohol, and refers to other remedies, called by names suggestive of vegetable composition, containing 26.2 per cent., 18.8 per cent., and 21 per cent. of alcohol.

It is not difficult to understand the ease with which makers of these remedies obtain certificates of their remedial value from preachers, statesmen and women, but one would expect medical men to be too wary to be

caught in the trap. Their endorsement by physicians always suggests to me ludicrous credulity, therapeutic ignorance or downright bribery.

Many of the pain-curing secret remedies, used by the laity and prescribed by dishonest doctors, contain acetanilid, phenacetin, and similar agents, in unknown quantity. The danger to life assumed by the administration of these powerful drugs, in indefinite amounts, is so great that a thinking man must stand aghast at the temerity of physicians, who prescribe mixtures of unknown composition for the relief of headache, neuralgia and other ills. Acetanilid and its congeners are known to depress the heart and may have a hemolytic, or disorganizing, effect upon the blood itself. (*University of Pennsylvania Medical Bulletin*, 15, 462, 1903, quoted by *Journal of the American Medical Association*, March 21, 1903, 786). The *Journal of the American Medical Association* (January 16, 1904, 177) expresses the belief that a recent increase in the number of sudden deaths from heart disease in New York City was due to the unusual consumption of acetanilid.

It is not surprising that addiction to the use of acetanilid, alcohol, and cocain is frequent among persons of unsuspected impropriety in this regard. The unnecessary taking of medicine for all kinds of real and imaginary minor ills is common. The storekeeper and the druggist, whose function is to sell goods, naturally encourage the consumption of proprietary medicines and vaunt their remedial qualities. The doctor should protect the public from such insiduous intoxicants and poisons by refusing to condone their use or prescribe them.

The remedy for the evil lies in the development of a feeling of individual responsibility in the medical faculty. Let every doctor refuse to accept samples of secret medicines, refuse to waste time talking thera-

peutics with smooth-tongued salesmen, refuse to debauch medical science by believing the mendacious advertisements called by the trade "literature," and treat his patients honestly by giving them, what they pay for, the best result of his own knowledge and experience.

I think with pleasure of the discomfiture of a drummer for a much-advertised lithia water, when I told him in my office that I did not expect to prescribe the said water, because Professor M————, of the University of ————, had analyzed a number of the lithia waters on the market and had told me that he could find no lithia in any of them. The stereotyped reply, to all agents of secret nostrums, that I do not prescribe medicines of whose composition I am kept in ignorance, has saved me many hours for more advantageous professional work than conversation with men whom I despise.

It is possible that efficient aid may be obtained, in our crusade against this evil, through congressional legislation. The law which gives the Public Health Service a limited supervision over the manufacture of, and interstate traffic in, viruses, serums, antitoxins and the like, and the proposed Heyburn Pure Food and Drug Bill are steps in the right direction.

In all these questions of such moment to the state, the essential element is the honesty of the individual members of society. It is said that "corporations have no souls." The proverb is justified by the fact that men, who constitute corporations, put their individual consciences and ideals of right aside, as soon as their actions are assignable to a body of men instead of to its individual members. As incorporation limits individual financial responsibility, so it acts as a narcotic to individual rectitude. This is seen in larger fields of action, as in governments, which will steal harbors from heathen Chinese, rob African farmers of

their country and freedom, and under the color of diplomacy emulate even the father of lies.

Though corporations and governments have no souls they, fortunately for the preservation of civilization and religion, are sure to suffer the penalty of their misdeeds. In this, at least, they are no more apt to escape punishment than men. Economic laws avenge economic follies and sins with much the same resistless energy as is seen in the operations of the natural law and the moral law.

The doctor sees the sins of youth bear fruit in old age, and the sins of the father visited upon the children down to the third and fourth generation. He, as others, sees in history the same process exhibited in the remote effects of corporate and governmental vice. He knows how murder committed under military sanction is only a little less debauching than murder committed under the sanction of a lynching bee; he knows how political robbery and ballot frauds lead to a deterioration of the public morality and health; and he realizes from observation that nothing is so relentless as the orderly course of the laws of nature and of nature's God.

To whom then shall the state look for preservation of its health, to whom shall the state call for help in time of trouble, in whom shall the state place its hope for deliverance from political corruption? The honest citizen; and the honest doctor is his best representative.

THE POLITICAL SIDE OF MEDICINE.

Politics in its broadest and truest sense is the science and art of business as applied to aggregations of people. The invitation to take part in a discussion on medicine and politics has been accepted, because I have always been interested in the executive work of medical organizations and because I believe the good citizen is the man who exhibits a lively interest in the business activities of his county, State and neighborhood. A British medical man, who had shown direct personal interest in national politics, was once reminded by a fellow-physician that "medicine is a jealous mistress." "True," was the reply, "but I shall give her no cause for jealousy." This gentleman subsequently became a member of the British government. I do not believe that his knowledge of medical science made him any less a wise statesman. It is probable that the sanitary and other medical acts of the British people were the better because of the influential post held by this doctor of physic.

A western newspaper said, some time ago, that the physician should not be permitted to escape his obligation to take active part in local politics, and asserted that the doctor is needed in even the higher fields of civic usefulness. This is the right view of the case.

In my medical infancy I was taught that a physician should abstain from all public activity, except the practice of medicine. The theory was based on the belief that the field of medicine was wide enough to occupy him fully and that, therefore, he could not hope to compete with others in intellectual matters outside of med-

icine and at the same time attain eminence in medicine. It was also assumed that success in practice was perhaps more sure if the public never thought of him except as a doctor. This teaching held it unwise in a physician to give popular lectures, even on medical topics, inexpedient to accept official positions in social or educational organizations and detrimental to be known as occupied with civic questions.

This doctrine held sway over me during my professional adolescence. After a time, however, I was driven by indignation at the condition of the political party, whose basic principles I espouse, to drop my attitude of indifference to all things outside of medicine. I came gradually to believe that for a doctor to neglect personal attention to civic and political problems is selfish and unjustifiable. His educational advantages, his special knowledge of sanitary requirements, his trained judgment, his self-restraint and poise in responsible situations, his familiarity with the vagaries of human nature and the respect shown him by his fellow-citizens make him eminently qualified for executive work and even leadership in civic affairs. This has recently been most conspicuously shown in this country by Dr. Justus Ohage, Health Commissioner of St. Paul, Minnesota, and in Cuba by Dr. Leonard Wood, the Governor-General.

If a young man studies medicine with the single idea of accumulating money, it may be that he will accomplish his end more quickly by confining his exertions to the medical rut, indicated by the theory under discussion. This is, however, by no means sure. It is not unlikely that an acceptance of the duties of citizenship would enlarge his circle of friends and patients, and give opportunity for better and higher medical achievement. Narrowness of interest creates narrowness of

mind, and no vocation needs broader mental grasp than medicine.

The man of education, brains and capability owes a certain part of his day to the community in which he lives and to association with which his personal success and happiness are due. If he does not give it, he is not doing his full duty to mankind. The greater the advantages he possesses, the greater the call to serve God by serving man. Few men, as a class, have greater personal capacity than physicians. Few that owe more to the State.

It is possible that this due to the State should not be paid too early in the doctor's career. It may be true that in his medical adolescence he should stick to medicine almost entirely; but the time surely comes when he should aid personally in the endeavor to raise the standard of health, honesty, education and beauty in the region in which he resides. This he must strive for, even if his efforts fail to show any immediate practical results. Time may be required to convince his community that sanitary plumbing, pure water and compulsory vaccination pay. Men of lower ideals may deny that official dishonesty and public indecency sap the vigor of a village or town, and inevitably lead not only to higher taxes but also to diminished personal safety. It may not be clear to all his fellows that widespread education of the young and systematic beautification of towns and cities attract desirable residents, raise the value of property and increase the happiness of all.

Let him devote a portion of his days to the inculcation of these truths, while continuing his professional work in sick-room, hospital and college. He will then find that his life is more valuable to his fellow-man than that of the doctor, who from laziness, carelessness or timidity neglects his civic duty under the pretense that his professional work is too exacting to permit

such diversion of energy. The doctor's work for the state to be successful must have the same quality as his work in medicine. Earnestness and sincerity, honesty and courage, intelligence and courtesy are as essential in one as the other. He must be willing in both activities to labor without thought of personal reward. To do something is a surer source of happiness than to be somebody.

If physicians take the part in civic life which is suggested by these words, much will be done to hasten the time when we shall not feel abashed to name the place in which we live or to mention the political party we espouse. Whenever medicine has touched politics, politics has been bettered. It is almost a truism that, whenever politics has touched medicine, medicine has been smirched. A corrobation of the first statement is found in the present condition of Havana, in which seaport the U. S. army surgeons and the medical Governor-General have blotted out the sanitary disgrace of two centuries. The blighting effect of the injection of politics into sanitary medicine is well known. The politicians of California denied for months the existence of bubonic plague in San Francisco, although scientific medical men proved its existence by incontrovertible evidence. Mayor Schmitz of the metropolis has recently "satisfied himself" that no cases ever existed in the city, and has removed four of the members of the Board of Health because of their activity in seeking to stop the spread and existence of plague. This action reminds me of a certain laughable assertion of Mayor Ashbridge, when typhoid fever was endemic in one section of Philadelphia, because of a contaminated water supply. His honor vigorously denied the existence of any unusual number of cases, claiming that in his opinion the cases called typhoid fever were really only "enteric" fever.

These two examples of municipal medicine are enough to convince the most doubting that medical science, if not the medical man himself, is urgently needed in civic executive circles.

The somewhat frequent membership of physicians in school boards is an undoubted advantage to the public. This is especially true in the State of Pennsylvania, where in many of the rural districts the local school board may, under State law, assume the duties and powers of a local board of health. It is discouraging, however, to hear that a physician recently felt compelled to decline to serve longer on a certain school board in Philadelphia, because the perpetual use of improper methods by politicians interfered with the best interests of education. The children of that city suffer much in educational privileges because of the interference of "practical" politics in school management. Teachers are appointed by "pull," and, it is said, by bribes, instead of on merit; schools are overcrowded and the children are given half time, because school directors are selected for political reasons. The best recommendation for school director in republican Philadelphia is willingness to obey the machine. A considerable number, therefore, are saloonkeepers by occupation and school directors by political favor.

The executive business of hospitals, of medical schools and of societies devoted to medical subjects constitutes what is often termed medical politics. Here the doctor has frequent opportunity of showing his skill in carrying on business enterprises and may exercise the talent of leadership. His success is probably equal to that obtained by men of equal ability in any other one walk of life. While he may lack the office training of a boy brought up in a bank or store, his stock of general information, his knowledge of human nature, his judicial mind and his habit of scientific accuracy will soon

enable him to equal, if not outstrip, his nonprofessional colleague in executive grasp and precision. This assertion does not apply to the doctor. who is ignorant of scientific medicine. who never cultivates his powers of observation, who through laziness or indifference prescribes ready-made secret nostrums of whose physiological action he can have no real knowledge, or who flies from one new medical hobby to another.

It has been thought by some that medical men should have no voice in the management of medical schools or hospitals. They are said to be deficient in business training and methods, and it is thought that their professional relations with other medical men render them injudicious or weak disciplinarians. This view should be no more true in medicine than in legal or military circles. Courts martial are universally used to determine truth and fix responsibility in army and navy matters; and in civil life lawyers are, as other citizens, under the judicial control of members of the bar.

There is no question that much depends on the individual. Some business men know very little business, as some doctors and lawyers know very little medicine and law. A not inconsiderable experience with professional and nonprofessional men has shown me that the lifelong pursuit of business or law does not necessarily develop energy, accuracy and honesty; nor does the same number of years devoted to the study and alleviation of disease always develop these essential traits of a successful and honorable career. Taking all things into consideration, however, I would feel that the purse and the good name of an institution were safer in the hands of what I may call the composite doctor than those of the composite lawyer or business man. Special talent and special training will always tell, but no one vocation has in its ranks all the talent and all the training of the community.

One should not expect lawyers to break rules and regulations and defy laws, statutes and precedents, in order to have their wishes carried out, but they occasionally do. One would not expect business men to incur unnecessary debts, or to look for success when the outgo exceeds the income, but such things are constantly seen in investigations of financial and commercial enterprises. It can not be denied that doctors do likewise We all have humanity's failings and vices.

My contention is that medical men are of decided advantage in the governing boards of hospitals, colleges and other institutions. They make good officers and are not as likely as others to be deceived in the qualifications of medical teachers or subordinates. The kind of doctors frequently selected by business men as their family physicians is strong testimony as to the faultiness of their discrimination in this respect. Doctors, moreover, are not more apt to be cowardly, unjust or tricky than business men. I may be prejudiced, but I am rather inclined to rate the courage, equanimity, justice and honesty of doctors above the same qualities in other men. There are undoubtedly some despicable doctors, but I have not met very many.

In a certain New England hospital, a medical officer made some years ago, a series of vivisectal experiments on sick and dying babies. I do not know whether the man was punished by the board of trustees; but he evidently did not expect to be, for he published an account of his nefarious work, and read before a learned society a paper detailing his results. In another hospital a year ago a distinguished teacher deliberately opened a woman's gall-bladder, for the sole purpose of demonstrating to some surgical guests his method of operating. Is it likely that these vivisectal operations on helpless human patients would be tolerated by a board of trustees in which medical men had seats? It

may be asserted that the governing boards in these institutions never knew of the improprieties committed by their medical subordinates. True, but my reply is that boards containing a few medical men could hardly remain ignorant of such infractions of propriety.

It is not unreasonable to suppose that the justice of paying for the services of the medical staffs of hospitals will be sooner recognized, when more boards of trustees contain medical members. Hospital service, conscientiously and scientifically rendered, takes so much time that few physicians or surgeons can afford to give it without a salary. Hence, much hospital work is done carelessly. Sometimes a younger man does the work, as an assistant, while the elder man gets the credit of doing charitable work without fee. The result of expecting the doctor to perform hospital service for nothing is often this: That hospitals either appoint inexperienced men with plenty of time and no private practice; or accept the gratuitous service of older and more experienced men, who slight the work, because their private patients are their first care.

According to *American Medicine* (May 25, 1901), the secretary of the Massachusetts General-Hospital has calculated the annual money-equivalent of the charitable work of the staff of that institution. His computation is based upon the charges for similar services in private practice, taking low figures for the fees. The valuation for the year 1899 is as follows:

2,421 surgical operations, at $25.....	$60,525
95,265 house visits at $2.....	190,530
104,205 out-patients visits at $2.....	208,410
	$459,465

It is probable that this institution follows the usual rule of American hospitals and pays no salaries to its medical staff. At one time, perhaps now, it would not

permit the members of the medical staff to accept fees even from private patients in the private rooms. The injustice of such customs and rules is evident when it is realized that a hospital could not exist without its corps of physicians and surgeons, which gives for nothing an amount of service equal in this instance to nearly half a million dollars a year. The superintendents, clerks, apothecaries, nurses and financial agents are paid, and the members of the staff should be paid also. The salary need not be large, but it ought to be enough to insure faithful service and to compensate in some measure for the time taken from the doctor's private duties.

In 1900, the number of in-patients treated in the twelve largest general hospitals in Philadelphia was 27,132. If each of these was seen once a day by a doctor at $2.00 per visit the money value of such advice would be $54,264. That seems a munificent daily donation to charity from the Medical Profession; even after deducting the amount paid by the small proportion of paying private patients in these hospitals.

It is evident that the men who give this much of their ability to the work of hospitals should be paid at least a moderate wage. It is equally clear that they should have representation on the governing boards.

In medical societies and college faculties the doctor has a chance to exhibit his efficiency and deficiency in political affairs. The prizes are not as high as in national or municipal politics, for salaried officers are few and fat contracts unknown. Still, the itch for office and power does cause many to descend to devious methods; and not a few instances could be mentioned to prove that there are physicians who believe in the creed that the end justifies the means. The opportunity for correcting such evils is, however, much greater in medical than in civic circles. The majority of medical

men have high ideals of conduct, and under leadership will awake from lethargy to right wrong-doing among their fellows. The final triumph of the general medical profession over the low grade medical colleges shows this fact. It was the American Medical Association, the State Medical Societies, the American Academy of Medicine and kindred bodies, which created the sentiment that enacted laws compelling the college faculties to raise the requirements for the medical diploma.

Those of us who have practised a few decades have seen, it is true, the self-seeking medical politician attain honorable position by undesirable manipulation of men, but honor has not been obtained by the holding of the honorable post. An irregular peg does not fit well in a square hole; and the dishonored man shows early his inability to fit accurately into an honorable office. The other man, who feels that self-respect must be had, though it comes high, contemplates with equanimity the misfit and smiles at the contortions of the misfitted peg in its endeavor to occupy comfortably the unaccommodating hole.

In the medical world the estimate is pretty generally correct, as to whom the profession should honor with its gifts of place and power. There is some degree of error, but it is by no means as great proportionately, as in the circles of business and economics. The doctor, if he live long enough, is pretty sure to have all the professional honor from his colleagues that he deserves. If he, early in life, obtain undeserved honor, he is apt to find later that, by a sort of retributive justice, his fellows learn of his defects and estimate him at his real worth. This is similar to the traditional delay of legal decisions. The medical profession comes to a just conclusion in the end, but it takes time. The estimate of the unintelligent public of professional worth may often

be wrong, but that of the physician's own colleagues seldom stays wrong, even if it be wrong in the first place. He, after all, will value most the expert opinion of his fellows.

An important phase of my topic is a consideration of the actions and reactions that take place between doctors and politicians in Municipal, State and National affairs. The principal points of contact are in health boards, hospitals, medical examining and licensing boards, pension examining boards, and the Army and Navy and the Marine-Hospital Service. The entrance of scientific men into deliberative assemblies must do good, for the increasing accuracy of science cannot fail to make its impress felt in shaping legislative policy. Sanitary and hygienic problems are of ever increasing importance in national life; and physicians have therefore the general training which makes their views on these topics weighty. The interests of commercialism and science may seem antagonistic, but in the broadest sense they are one. To deny the existence of bubonic plague in San Francisco may seem wise to politicians; but the intelligent sanitarian knows well that it is better to admit the truth at once and stamp out the disease by immediate action. Even if that action be the destruction of Chinatown by fire, it will be cheaper and wiser than the false security bred by wilful denial of the truth. To suppress the knowledge that tetanus germs have been found in vaccine virus ought not to be the function of a medical society.

The same short-sighted policy of mere opportunists has recently been exhibited, it is said, in France. The House of Deputies has given some thought to the prevention of food adulteration and to other sanitary subjects; and the medical deputies have been accused of being party to such sanitary legislation. It is said by The Journal of the American Medical Association that

the result has been a demand from commercial interests that doctors and hygienists be excluded from membership in the House of Deputies. If the statement be correct, it is an odd confirmation of my belief that commercialism and politics need the physician's honest heart and clear head to prevent consummate folly.

The American Medical Association will doubtless exert a more potent influence than it has in State and National politics; for since the reorganization it is much better fitted to make its wants known and to have its advice sought and heeded. I consider its Committee on National Legislation, which meets yearly at Washington, an instrument of increasing competency.

The State Medical Societies have done wonderfully good work in elevating the standard of medical education, since the Association, at its meeting at Newport about 18 years ago, sent to each of them the draft of a bill to create a State Board of Medical Examiners. The definite proposition, endorsed at that time by the Association, gave the State Societies a basis of action. The State laws adopted since then vary from the original scheme, but they have accomplished the purpose intended: the removal of medical licensure from the medical college to the State Government.

The movement must now be followed up until some form of reciprocity in, or transfer of, licenses be established between the States. Perhaps a certificate of a successful voluntary examination of high grade before a Board of Examiners representing the U. S. medical services, the American Medical Association and the whole medical profession would be accepted by the individual States as equivalent to their own examination.

The effect of political contact upon medical matters is usually deleterious. This is often seen in the selection of the medical staffs of hospitals under state or city control, the appointment of members of medical exam-

ining boards by Governors, and the selection of boards of pension examiners by Federal authority. It is not denied that good appointments are quite often made, but it is well known that it is the good of the party rather than the good of the service that usually regulates the selection. It is pull rather than proficiency that counts.

I know of a state board of examiners which some years ago had upon it, as examiner in materia medica, a man who asked the physiological action and dose of a certain much vaunted proprietary remedy. The applicants for license had never heard its name; the examiner had probably recently received a sample with "literature," or had been called upon by the manufacturers' drummer. I have also known of instances in which attempts were made by political forces to get examining and licensing boards to pass unqualified men.

These illustrations will perhaps suffice to justify my belief that medical science is liable to be injured by contact with politics, unless the doctors take part in politics and resolutely fight for a higher standard of public ethics. The work of pension boards and of municipal and state hospitals would be much improved, if the spoils system were replaced by the merit system. It has always seemed to me a mistake that President McKinley did not leave the pension examiners under civil service rules, where they were placed, I believe, by President Cleveland.

Sir Walter Scott wrote to a friend, in 1814, at the time Napoleon was sent to Elba, that the French Emperor's fate was "an awful lesson to sovereigns that morality is not so indifferent to politics as Machiavelians will assert." The present day needs some such assurance that politics must recognize the power of public morality. I know no man better able to teach morality and ethics to the politicians than the average doctor.

THE DOCTOR'S FEE—A PLEA FOR HONORABLE DEALING.

"Trust not to the omnipotency of gold, and say not unto it thou art my confidence." * * * * "Persons lightly dipped, not grained in generous honesty, are but pale in goodness, and faint-hearted in integrity." These reflections of the seventeenth century physician of Norwich seem a fitting introduction to this paper, prepared for the consideration of the twentieth century physicians of Philadelphia. Three hundred and fifty years have greatly changed, and for the better, the methods of treating disease and have much increased the physician's knowledge of nature's processes; but the fundamental principles of medical conduct and of the doctor's relation to his patient are still unaltered and unalterable.

"That he be as free from crafte and deceyte in all his workynges, as the East is from the Weast * * * that he taketh no cure in the hande for lucre or gaynes sake only, but rather for an honest and competent rewarde with a Godly affection to doe his diligence." Such should be the true surgeon said Thomas Gale in 1563 in the first surgery written in the English tongue. His words may well be associated with William Bulleine's contemporaneous advice to the apothecary: "To remember his ende, and the judgement of God; and thus I doe commende him to God, if he be not coneitous or craftie sekyng his owne lucre, before other mennes health succour and comfort." These quotations from our medical fathers sound a little old-fashioned, and look a trifle

unfamiliar in their spelling. Would they not sound discordant if read in parallel columns with the following statements recently published in the official organ of the American medical profession? "It is openly charged that certain men are to-day giving commissions to physicians sending them cases." A prominent physician not long ago read a paper before a medical society in which he advocated a division of the fee" (between the family physician and the consulting surgeon).

It is not the wish of the author of this paper to pose as the Doctor Purissimus of some half jesting or half sneering friend; nor does he desire to offend his hearers, as did the clergyman who was described by a prominent, but dissatisfied, member of his congregation, as "too damned pious." It is but the truth, however, to state that some recent personal experiences and observations have been the exciting cause of the preparation of this communication to the Philadelphia County Medical Society. To one who believes that the medical man belongs to a liberal profession and not to that portion of the body economic, whose sole object is the accumulation of money, certain tendencies now seen in the ranks of medicine cause distresss. The apparent drifting away from the ideals, which formerly held possession of the minds of physicians, forces the conclusion that a spirit of commercialism is replacing the spirit of professionalism. No slur is meant to be cast on the merchant, tradesman or promoter, who endeavors to increase his capital or his earnings in honest business enterprises; no intention exists to deprive the doctor of his right to earn his living by collecting proper compensation for his professional services. The point insisted upon, however, is this: that the province of the doctor is to relieve the sick and suffering and to subordinate to that first object of his calling the obtaining of a financial reward for his labor. "Do your duty and then collect your

money" is the physician's motto. "Be sure of your money before you deliver the goods" is the perfectly proper motto of the business man.

My critics may say that it is difficult to determine what is a proper and just enterprise and thrift in one's professional work and what is an improper commercial spirit. The decision should not be difficult for the honorable physician, who believes in the liberal spirit of his profession and who is inspired by the ideals of Gale, Bulleine, and Browne. In a recent discussion on the possible immoral tendency in art, a well-known teacher stated his opinion in some such words as these: "If the moral quality is so weak that you cannot taste it and the sensuous so strong that you cannot miss it, then the work of art is dangerous, no matter how well it is done." A similar test is all that is needed when a conscientious physician wishes to know what is allowable in his relations with his patient. If the sincerity, humanity, generosity and truthfulness of an action cannot be readily seen; while its selfishness, cupidity and necessary secrecy are recognizable, he may be quite sure that it does not meet the requirements of professional standards. Let me illustrate by a few examples. A well-known optician recently called upon me and showed me a hollow gold ball to be used in Mules' operation on the eye. His argument was that the use of this gold ball, instead of the usually employed glass sphere, would make the patient willing to pay me a much larger fee for my operation; since the operation would seem more important and expensive. In other words, my fee was not to be based on the skill and time required, but on the amount that the patient could be induced to give up without protest. I was to use a gold sphere, costing me three dollars, instead of a glass one costing thirty cents; not because it was better for the patient, which it was not, but because it would be a good bait by which to

play on his ignorance for a double or triple fee. Such a trick may be "good business," but it does not appeal to a physician. In my mail a few mornings ago I found the advertisement of a dealer in trusses, bandages and other surgical appliances. Snugly wrapped in the circular was a neatly printed slip, telling me that 25 per cent. commission would be given to me on sales made to my patients.

Not many years since, a half-page advertisement of a sanitarium appeared in a well-known medical journal, offering stock of the sanitarium company on very advantageous terms to doctors sending patients to that institution. It did not lessen the insult of this intimation to learn that the leading spirit of the sanitarium company was a Fellow of a learned medical organization of this State. A certain mineral springs company has recently, it is said, offered its stock to physicians, so as to induce them to advocate the use of its waters to their patients. Who does not know that in this city some opticians give, and some oculists shamefully accept, commissions on sales made to patients? The public should realize that an oculist, who insists on his patients buying their glasses at one or two special stores, lays himself open to the suspicion of being bribed to do so by a commission from the dealer. The same suspicion attaches to the doctor who unduly urges patients to buy medicines from one apothecary. It is true that spectacles and medicines should be accurately made and compounded; but there are usually too many reliable dealers, especially in large cities, to necessitate so restricted a choice for the mere benefit of the patient. Another scheme, to impose on the patient and extract from him what is practically two fees, consists in giving him a prescription for a medicine under a special name agreed upon by the doctor and the druggist who are in collusion. The patient is then obliged to go to

the apothecary mentioned by the doctor, even if it be several miles out of the way, under the impression forsooth that no other apothecary prepares the remedy so carefully. This business enterprise is not unlike that practised by some hospitals, which, to obtain a large and interesting accident service, keep beer and whisky ready for the men running the patrol wagon. Little wonder is it that the injured are at times driven many unnecessary squares and that certain institutions can show an unusually long list of accident cases. Whether these institutions similarly profit by using their private wards and rooms as boarding houses for members of State Legislatures and their friends, who visit the centres of gayety for pleasure or business, need not be discussed in this paper.

Life insurance companies seem to me to have a code quite unlike that which the true medical profession believes to be honorable. A couple of years ago I received a letter from a well-known life insurance company of this city saying that a Mr. So and So, who had applied for insurance, had once been under my professional care and would I kindly give the company information as to my diagnosis of the obscure abdominal condition, to aid its medical examiners in arriving at a conclusion as to the character of the risk. This unwarranted inquiry, apparently made without the knowledge of the man, who had entrusted his health to a supposedly honorable physician, elicited no reply. Soon I received a personal letter from the medical director of the company, who is an old and valued friend, making the same request. A firm refusal to disclose professional confidence without the consent of the patient closed the incident. It is supposable that many insurance companies are doing this thing constantly. It is not likely that my experience was an isolated one. Are doctors to be tempted by fees or claims of friendship to disclose professional

confidences, because life insurance companies doubt the skill of their medical examiners?

Take another side of the fee question. A New England life insurance company sent me several weeks ago a blank form of affidavit, usually filled up by the attending physician, when an insured person dies. I was told that if I would answer the questions and make affidavit as to the truthfulness of my replies, I would be paid a certain fee. When I replied that Dr. So and So was the attending physician and that I was merely the consultant, another letter was sent me saying that my affidavit would probably do, and that if I would indicate in pencil my replies I would be paid a certain fee. The fee spoken of in the second letter was twice that previously mentioned. Here again appeared to be an attempt on the part of a life insurance company to get a doctor to disclose confidential information about his patient; for neither letter showed that the relatives of the deceased desired my affidavit, and the unwillingness to apply to the attending physician, whose address I had given, awakened my suspicion. This suspicion was increased, possibly unjustly, by the doubling of the fee for the testimony, and the ease with which lead pencil replies could have been changed after I had sworn to the certificate.

Some doctors, it is believed, make a fee by accepting money from manufacturing drug companies for statements certifying to the excellence of their secret nostrums. These certificates are then published and distributed as advertisements. It is probable that in some cases the doctor has had little experience with the vaunted remedy; in others he may have used the preparation in his practice for a time and then have written a hurriedly prepared clinical report detailing the wonderful results obtained. The latter method will undoubtedly bring a higher financial reward from the drug

firm, for the report has the appearance of being a scientific investigation.

The editors of reputable medical journals have, I believe, been deceived at times by such literary outputs, and have printed these clinical experiences as original articles of real worth. The instigator of the supposed scientific test and the doctor, who has pocketed his fee, or bribe, from the exploiters of the synthetic compound or recently discovered alkaloid, probably smile at such innocence. The deceived editor and his thoughtful readers suspect the truth, however, when the writer orders many thousands of reprints of his clinical report and the drug house fills the mails with "literature" testifying to the successful use of its products by Dr. Blank, whose hospital and professional titles are conspicuously mentioned. These bribes for suborned testimony need not always take the shape of cash. Liberal donations of drugs for the doctor's private sanitarium or hospital or a few cases of carbonated water for his private use are perhaps offered and accepted as less likely to offend the sensibility of the professional conscience.

Great indeed, are the temptations of doctors who unite the running of a boarding house for the sick with the practice of medicine or surgery? Business methods are so different from truly professional methods that the necessary combination in the conduct of a private hospital or sanitarium is liable to result in damage to the integrity of the latter. It is so easy to charge unnecessarily large rates of board and to advise patients that a month's longer stay will be undoubtedly beneficial. Five or ten dollars a week added to the rate of board makes it even possible to be liberal enough to charge no fee whatever for operative treatment. How generous this seems to the unsuspecting patient!

It is a question whether the testimony given in suits

for damages, against railroads and other corporations, is not at times biased by the knowledge that the doctor will get no fee for his attendance, if the patient fails to "recover" for his injury. I was once asked to give a note saying that I was too busy to come to court to testify, because it was known that my opinion would be unfavorable to the cause of the plaintiff. Does any one doubt that acceding to the request would have rendered the payment of my bill more certain?

What is more despicable than the action of that operator who gets his patient ready for operation, perhaps even upon the operating table, and then declines to go a step further until the family or friends pay at once a fee for professional services. Patients' trickiness and unwillingness to settle just claims may almost seem to require this sort of shrewdness; but professional standards do not indorse it. Better is it to be defrauded than to resort to the methods of the road agent and the blackmailer. One modern surgeon at least has suffered from reports, let us hope untrue reports, that he has used this method to collect his fees.

There has been developed of late a system of paying commissions to the family physician who brings medical or surgical cases to the consultant. Sometimes this takes the shape of agreeing to give the doctor, who succeeds in sending or bringing the patient to the operator or medical consultant, a percentage of the fee obtained for the operation or advice. At other times, the iniquity of this arrangement being understood by both medical conspirators, the family doctor is made a quasi assistant, and is paid by the surgeon or gynecologist a part of the fee. A recent investigator of this evil declares that he wrote letters to a number of well-known operators in a single city, asking whether they would give him a commission on patients sent to them. The number of affirmative replies was astonishing evidence of the extent

of this criminal traffic in human suffering. The statement is not unworthy of confidence, as is shown by this extract from the columns of the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, of February 2, 1901:

"Resolutions on division of fees.—The committee to whom was referred the resolutions of the Chicago Medical Society, January 23d, met and adopted the following resolutions, which were recommended by the Society for adoption: '*Resolved,* That the offering, or the giving of a commission, or percentage of a fee, by a consulting physician or operating surgeon, or the asking or receiving such a fee or commission in any guise whatsoever, by the physician referring the case, is dishonest, disreputable and unethical, unless such arrangement be made with the full knowledge of the patient; *Resolved,* That a violation of this resolution shall subject the offender to expulsion from the Society.' The resolutions were adopted unanimously by a rising vote. The Physicians' Club has passed resolutions to the same effect: '*Resolved,* That the Physicians' Club of Chicago most severely condemns the seeking for or receiving of a commission or part of a consultation or operation fee, as well as the offering or giving of a commission, or a part of a fee, as practices highly dishonorable and detrimental to the best interests of the medical profession'."

It is not the province of this address to elaborately argue against the propriety of such an arrangement; which tempts the family physician to look first, not to the welfare of the confiding patient, but to how the most profit may be made out of his ill health or accident; and which tempts the consultant to raise his fee to an extortionate figure, in order to divide with his "pal." The fact that such a commission arrangement is always concealed from the patient is a sufficient proof of its professional impropriety. The excuse, given by the family doctor that the patient will pay a large fee to

the consultant, and leave his bill unpaid, is no adequate apology. It is the family doctor's duty to collect his bill by fair not foul means; and it is the duty of the consultant, it must be remembered, not to charge such an exorbitant fee that the patient's means are so exhausted that he cannot pay the doctor, who has attended and who is to attend him.

Few consulting surgeons, I imagine, have not met this evil in some form or other. It may be a quiet request to add, to the consultant's fee, a certain sum "for me." It may be put in this wise: "Do not mention your fee, as being so much, before the patient; for I have told him it was so much, because I wanted this much for myself." The latter admonition, after an operation done for a medical acquaintance, was my first intimation of a possibility of such dishonor in the profession. The doctor who called me in consultation subsequently became the president of his county medical society. I evidently had seen a side of his character which his colleagues had not had disclosed to them. The family physician should, undoubtedly, charge more than his usual fee, when he meets another physician in consultation over his patient's case. The visit is longer than usual, more important than usual, and makes more demand upon the family doctor. He therefore should receive additional compensation. If he does not charge a proper fee under these circumstances and collect it, he is unjust to himself. It happens, however, not infrequently that the general practitioner fears that the consultant will charge so much that he cheats himself, in order to be sure that the patient may have the advantage of the best consultant skill. It is to be regretted that the extravagant estimate put by some consultants upon the value of their operative and diagnostic skill justifies the fear that either the family doctor must go without

proper compensation or the patient lack the benefit of additional professional service.

Have we not all known of honorable and faithful physicians treating men and women in moderate circumstances for practically nothing, and who, having called a surgeon or physician in consultation, have been shocked and astonished at the large fees demanded and even insisted upon? If the general practitioner grades his fee down to the financial condition of the sick or injured man, should not the consultant have a similar reasonable appreciation of professional humanity? Put the case in another way. If doctors treat fellow members of the profession without fee, if they treat doctors' wives and children without charge, should they not be willing to operate upon, or see in consultation, without charge, a doctor's patient, when that patient is unable to pay? The logic seems irresistible. If the physician is worried and anxious about his case and desires advice from a man, who has had more experience in that particular disease, it seems only proper that his brother practitioner should come to his aid as a consultant for a small fee, or for no fee, if none is obtainable from the patient. It is the bond of professional brotherhood that seeks to lessen the mental stress in both instances. Yet consultants have been known, I understand, to refuse to thus relieve the anxiety of a doctor, because the payment by the patient of a certain fee was not possible. There is little doubt that the family physician at times pays consultation fees out of his own pocket, in order to do his best for patients with whose straitened circumstances he is familiar. Does not all Scotland know of Weelum MacClure's offer, when Sir George came to the Highlands to save the life of Tammas Mitchell's wife? Did not Sir George do more honor to medicine by his refusal to take the check of MacClure's partner in humanity than by his brilliant operation? Some doctors

of the twentieth century need to read that story again, before sending out their bills.

The consultant sometimes, in his anxiety for his fee, unjustly assumes that the family physician should play the rôle of collector, because the patient lags in the payment of the debt. I well remember the righteous indignation of a certain country physician, when, some years ago, he was almost dunned by a metropolitan surgeon, who found difficulty in collecting a consultation fee.

A trust, or at least a belief, in the "omnipotency of gold" seems to have debauched the professional spirit of these days. Perhaps, however, the doctors only breathe the same air and react to the same environment, as their business associates. The professional result, however, seems to the doctors of the school of ethics of Browne and Gale to be more deplorable than that exhibited in the ranks of trade. The chief end of business is financial gain; but the doctor should take "no cure in the hande for lucre or gaynes sake only." It is this different viewpoint that makes the "pursuit of avarice" in a doctor's work so objectionable.

Is it not true that doctors' bills against the estates of deceased patients are at times larger than they would have been for the same amount of medical attendance, had the sick man lived? Do not surrogates and orphans' courts act justly in viewing with suspicion the large bills sometimes presented for adjudication? Is there not reason for thinking that some medical men are willing to charge a larger fee than their custom, when they know that dead men can neither complain nor confer benefit by contracting future bills for medical service? I recently heard of a doctor replying to a criticism that his bill against the patient's estate was too large, by saying that he always charged more when the patient died, because the death hurt his reputation. Such reasoning

must be very soothing to the surgeon who has a fatal result to bewail. If carried to its legitimate conclusion, the argument would indicate that the justifiability of an operative procedure should be decided by the ailing patient, and the work done by a surgical engine without soul, conscience or heart. Then would Petrarch's innuendo that physicians trifled with human sickness for game and mercenary gain be justified (*Medical Economy During the Middle Ages.* Fort, p. 428), and the boy's objection to becoming a doctor because "he could not kill a cat" seem a valid reason for adopting another means of livelihood.

It is scarcely to be doubted that the triumphs of modern medicine and surgery have turned the heads of some practitioners, and that charges have been so large in certain instances as to be properly dubbed extortionate. The chronicles of the Middle Ages show, according to Fort (p. 461) that recourse to saintly remedies was induced by the excessive demands of the doctors, by which entire patrimonies were frequently swallowed up before recourse was had to these ecclesiastical curative agencies. Uncommon pharmaceutical compounds or double doses were prescribed as necessary medicaments, when the patient was wealthy, while for the poor the smallest dose was considered sufficient to cure. Do not these records afford food for thought on the relation of professional fees to the Christian Science Healer, to Hospital Abuse, and to the Gold Cure for Inebriety?

The medical professors of the Middle Ages are said to have been able to dictate terms, because "affluent invalids readily believed it impossible to escape death" unless attendance by these eminent doctors was secured. Do we not see evidences of this morbid relief, at the present day; and is not its abuse advancing "practitioners rapidly to enormous wealth and pomposity?" (Fort, op. cit., p. 428).

Does any member of this Society really believe that eight thousand or ten thousand dollars is a just fee for the performance of any possible gynecological or surgical operation, done on a private citizen, even if the patient be a multi-millionaire? By a fee for the performance of an operation, I mean the charge for the operation alone, not including the preparatory treatment, the after treatment, the nursing, or the hospital private room. I admit the possibility that the national importance of a patient, a ruler for example, might increase the surgeon's responsibility so much that this enormous fee might be justifiable. Under other circumstances its propriety is scarcely conceivable. Would anyone present to-night justify the action of a surgeon, who when asked for his bill said, "I send no bill, but I get for such professional service from five hundred to ten thousand dollars"? This is the attitude of the negro porter on the sleeping car, who, with a scrape of his foot, says to the man whose hat he has brushed, "Gib me what you please, sah;" because he hopes to get a half dollar for ten cents' worth of service. This attitude may not demean an ex-slave, but it does not seem worthy of a medical gentleman, does it?

If such fees are to be asked by medical practitioners of to-day, the patient certainly ought to be frankly apprised of the fact, before he is allowed to incur the debt. I know of an instance where a physician of eminence was requested to come to a distant town to see a patient in consultation; a telegraphic reply was promptly sent, "My fee is three hundred dollars, shall I come?" I have little criticism to offer to this frank mode of action. It is a different thing when a patient, with trusting confidence submits to the professional offices of a doctor, and receives a bill of such proportions that it takes years of self-sacrificing economy to discharge the debt.

There is, it seems to me, one just plan by which fees should be regulated. It is that the doctor should have an estimate of the value of his services, operative or otherwise, fixed in his mind. The amount should be based on his experience and skill. It should not be so low as to coax away unjustly the patients of the younger and less experienced men of the profession. This fee should be lessened when the financial position of the patient would make its payment a serious burden. It is not professional or humane to take a man's income for a whole year, to pay for the doctor's bill of a month. A well-to-do patient should pay the full fee, which should be generous in order to recompense the doctor for his expensive education and hazardous life. This fee, however, should not be increased because the services of the doctor are utilized by a very wealthy person, unless an unusual time is given to the service or additional responsibility is placed upon the physician by reason of the man's position. "Make it up on a rich person," or "Charge him a big fee, because he is a millionaire" are admonitions not to be heeded by the true physician; but only by that healer of men's ills who is but "lightly dipped in generous honesty and faint-hearted in integrity." Such words may do for the motto of the man who is "coueitous or craftie sekyng his owne luere, before other mennes health sueeour and comfort," but not for the doctor who taketh "the eure in the hande" for "an honest and competent rewarde with a Godly affection to doe his diligence."

PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY IN ACCIDENT CASES INVOLVING LITIGATION.

The professional responsibility of the medical attendant or examiner employed by the party sued for damages and that of the doctor of the patient injured are identical. The duty of both is to obtain, as soon as possible, restoration of the victim's health and a just settlement of the pecuniary debt of the agent responsible for the accident.

The experience of the public in recent years has caused a justifiable distrust of the opinions of partisan surgeons employed by corporations as well as of the views of experts paid by patients endeavoring to recover damages. Medical men can do more than any other citizens to dispel this doubt as to the reliability of professional testimony. The medical profession is responsible for its existence and should therefore feel an impelling duty to sweep away every cause of suspicion as to the honesty, justness and reliability of the medical evidence.

The result of a suit must depend almost entirely on the medical testimony, and partisanship has no place in the professional investigation of diagnosis, prognosis or treatment. Truth and justice are the two objects to be sought by doctor, lawyer, judge and jury. The doctor's single duty is to be honest and reasonable, not laying undue stress on any symptoms and not claiming omniscience.

The injuries which require medicolegal investigation may for the present purpose be divided into three classes:

1. Cases in which there is obvious physical lesion of

a serious character, such as fracture, dislocation, or wounds. Here the surgeon's medico-legal responsibility centres to a great extent in the prognosis, for the diagnosis and treatment are sufficiently clear.

2. Cases in which a physical lesion is obvious, but is evidently of little importance. Here the professional responsibility is largely concerned with diagnosis, and the doctor must be on the alert to detect, by careful and repeated examinations, symptoms of obscure injury to the nervous system or other deep structures.

3. Cases of mental shock without obvious physical lesion, in which there is a possibility of the development at a later time of the so-called functional disturbances to which the term traumatic neurosis has been applied. Here the prime responsibility of the surgeon appears to me to be the prevention, by judicious treatment, of the development of the nervous derangement. Many of the nervous wrecks seen in the courts, demanding, and often receiving from juries, large sums of money for accidents, are the creation of injudicious, thoughtless or dishonest doctors.

In all these classes of injury there may be developed a hysterical or neurasthenic element; but it is in the last two classes that such neuroses are most likely to occur.

In this paper the open attitude of suspicion frequently exhibited by corporation agents towards injured persons and their medical attendants is not under discussion; but the unjust verdicts sometimes obtained explain that attitude. Crafty lawyers and dishonest doctors are obtainable in all large communities to aid in a miscarriage of justice and to bring discredit on their respective professions.

Immediate and careful examination, with accurate record of the patient's statements and of the symptoms at the time of injury, the avoidance of injurious sug-

gestions, the prompt institution of scientific treatment, and an early settlement of damages will diminish litigation and hasten the recovery of the patient.

The doctor should make several examinations, because errors and oversights are thus avoided. He should remember that disease may have existed before injury, that disease may follow injury and yet not be due to it, that the patient may be mistaken and not dishonest, and that hysteria and neurasthenia are common conditions, which may exist with organic lesions without being directly connected therewith.

Corporations liable to be sued would save money by always employing experienced practitioners to examine the injured early, in company with the medical attendant, and by insisting upon at least two such examinations. This procedure would usually get at the truth, often restrain the patient from malingering, sometimes prevent the development of traumatic hysteria or neurasthenia, perhaps scare away scheming lawyers and doctors, and generally restore the patient's health more promptly.

Delay in settlement, too many examinations by various doctors, unwise suggestions of symptoms made by thoughtless examiners, and numerous conferences with lawyers are productive, in many instances, of traumatic neurosis and have unjustly drawn many thousands of dollars from corporation treasuries.

In conclusion, I desire to emphasize two points: First, that an ignorant, careless or injudicious doctor may be the real cause of many cases of traumatic hysteria and neurasthenia; and, secondly, that prompt settlement of damage suits is an inestimable aid in the cure of accidental injuries associated with litigation.

THE NECESSITY OF MEMBERSHIP IN COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETIES.

At this time no man can afford to stand alone in his business or profession. The spirit of the age is for organization of trades, business interests and even professions. The individual must therefore join with his colleagues, if he desires to gain the best position for himself in a commercial, social and industrial sense.

As everybody is joining the local medical organizations, it will soon be considered odd for a reputable physician to remain outside the ranks of his county medical society. The public will begin to feel that there is something about him which makes him unacceptable to his fellow-workers. This tendency is becoming so marked that no doctor, who depends on the practice of medicine for his livelihood, can afford to remain outside of the county medical organization of his part of the country. It is advisable for a young doctor to join as soon after graduation as the rules of the society will permit him to enter. This advice is given, because he is liable to find more animosities after several years of practice than when he is young and not considered a rival of much importance in obtaining public confidence. Those who have allowed years to pass after graduation, without uniting with such a medical organization, are apt to find their work of such a character that they think it unnecessary to become a member. This course creates a tendency for routine work, and makes it difficult for the doctor to get out of the rut, which many years of laborious practice have made for him. It is far better to join early in life and keep abreast of one's fellows.

Some may object to joining medical societies, because they cannot approve of the acts and characteristics of some of those already members. This is not a valid reason for refraining from membership, because it is a professional duty to elevate the standard of the society; and this can be done better from the inside than the outside.

Membership in a county medical society means, for the doctor, fellowship with the medical profession of his immediate neighborhood, of the county in which he lives, of his State and of the whole nation; for, through the county medical society, he obtains membership in the medical organization of the State and of the United States. This association is valuable for many reasons: It enlarges his social connections very materially, and gives him, his wife and his children congenial and intellectual companionship. It has long been observed that in towns and villages the doctor and his family associate with the best people and are usually among the best educated and the most prosperous citizens. It is not meant by this statement that doctors as a rule become rich, because doctors do not make large sums of money. The income of medical men does not compare with that which can be made by men in commercial life, who can employ a multitude of clerks and hands to increase the profits from business. A doctor has to do everything himself, and cannot delegate much of his work to an assistant with advantage. For this and other reasons a doctor is not likely to be a wealthy citizen. It is, however, true that physicians are, as a rule, not only the best educated and most influential citizens; but are prosperous up to the point of comfort, even if they are not to be numbered among the unusually rich. Association, therefore, with the medical men and their families in one's neighborhood is sure to bring congenial friends and companions.

Connection with the county medical society, in which

one is almost sure to find the most active and most successful doctors of the neighborhood, is a good investment as a business step. The friends so made can be depended upon to act as substitutes in time of sickness, or when the doctor goes on his vacation. It is always easy then to obtain counsellors in difficult cases and assistants to help in giving ether or in performing obstetrical or other operations. The knowledge of one's medical neighbors obtained at the meetings of the county medical society enables a man to pick out those of special ability, when the members of his own family need medical advice. It is not only agreeable, but often very valuable, to know that one can give his wife and children notes of introduction to the best medical men in the place which they expect to visit, if they go traveling.

This advantage which comes from aiding in the medical organization of the profession is, perhaps, more noticeable among doctors than in other walks of life. It has often surprised the writer, for example, to see how little the lawyers of a large city are acquainted personally with the best members of the bar in neighboring towns and cities. It is likely that members of that profession, as well as business men, have within the last few years greatly enlarged their opportunities in this respect by the organization of state and national societies.

A marked advantage of the social intercourse arising from membership in the same society is the prevention of ill-natured criticism on the part of one's professional rivals for patronage. The doctor is always greatly strengthened in his hold upon his own patients, if the physicians in his town are his personal friends. The public is quite sure to have a considerable degree of confidence in a man who is known to be on friendly terms with all his professional colleagues, and who is known to be sent for by them and to send for them, in cases difficult to treat. The possibility of having as a con-

sultant any doctor that has a reputation for special skill, adds very much to the family physician's reputation among his own patients. To be able to get a friend to come from another town, to see a patient even without a fee, is no mean advantage in time of serious illness among one's poor patients. Good fellowship and personal acquaintance with the best men in the county will often enable a doctor to retain his patients in their own homes, even if important surgical or special treatment is required. The expense to the patient of an absence from home is avoided, if a doctor in the same neighborhood is obtained to do operative work. Under other circumstances it might be necessary to send the patient to a distant city, when he, of course, passes from under the immediate care of his family physician, who cannot take the time to remain with him for several weeks while he is under treatment far from home. The fees are then lost to the home doctor.

The support of a medical organization, when ignorant patients threaten suits for alleged imperfect results in practice, is another advantage that comes from membership in the organized profession. Some county medical societies undertake the defense of, and the supply of legal counsel to, their members. Even in cases where this is not done, the moral support of the doctors in the same district, instead of their enmity or inactivity, is most important.

The medical defense by-law in one county medical society in Pennsylvania has stopped annoying suits, which dissatisfied patients were about to begin against members. The mere fact that the doctor was known to be a member of a society, which employed prominent counsel and was ready to defend him in court, was sufficient to cause the intended suit to be dropped. It is a great comfort to a doctor to think that he has his professional associates and neighbors back of him; and all

of us are liable to be subjected to annoyance from patients dissatisfied with treatment, however, innocent we may be of carelessness or ignorance. A good many doctors have often found also that in collecting bills, which have been disputed by patients or executors, it is important to show that the best doctors in the neighborhood will be put upon the stand to testify to the value of the medical services.

Some county societies have associations for affording financial aid to members and their families in case of pecuniary distress. It sometimes occurs that doctors die leaving very little estate. To know that one's widow and orphans will be looked after by the county society or its aid association is a valid reason for joining a county medical society.

Nothing has thus far been said of the scientific advantage accruing from society membership, because it has been the wish of the writer to make prominent in the first place the commercial value of such association. No man can practice medicine scientifically and keep up with the developments in therapeutics, unless he reads medical journals and comes in close contact with the young men, just out of college, and the older men, who are devoting themselves to scientific work in addition to, or instead of, medical practice. Medical journals cost a good deal of money. To go to a distant city for post-graduate work costs more. While there is no doubt of the value of both these methods of keeping in touch with medical advances, many men will find it difficult to avail themselves of them. Attendance upon county medical society meetings and upon the connected State and National meetings afford, however, the same sort of instruction.

In the local society men hear new methods of diagnosis and new methods of treatment considered and criticised: and thus may be given a new insight into

many of their obscure and difficult cases. Pathology, upon which therapeutics is founded, cannot very well be studied by the active practitioner. In the medical society meeting, however, he hears the latest researches of foreign and native scientists mentioned, and thus learns what is being done in all parts of the world much more promptly than he would be apt to do, if he waited until he read a large number of journals. In fact, some of these matters are only discussed in journals written in a foreign tongue, which he might be unable to read, even if he had had the opportuntiy. A man who attends a good medical society regularly will find that he is taking what is practically a form of post-graduate course. Such meetings are important for the specialist, who is very apt to become narrow, if he keeps away from them, as well as for the general practitioner, who may have no time or inclination to study special branches of medicine, but hears papers on special subjects at these meetings.

Membership in the county medical societies of Pennsylvania does not cost a great deal. It carries with it a membership in the Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania, and gives without cost, the Pennsylvania Medical Journal, containing the papers read before the State Medical Society. Through this connection with the county and state medical societies, the doctor becomes eligible to membership in the American Medical Association, upon the payment of five dollars a year. He gets for this five dollars, in addition to membership, one of the best weekly medical journals in the world.

Such advantages are not to be despised, and it behooves every doctor, who can possibly gain admission to a county society to take early steps to accomplish that end.

No mention has been made of the desirable vacation trips which can be taken by the doctor and his family.

by attending the meetings of his State Medical Society and the American Medical Association. These large organizations meet at a time of year, when the vacation trip is desirable and pleasant, and they afford low rates by railroad to the points of meeting. Such trips are beneficial for the doctor and his family, because every worker, whether in the household, in a profession or in business, is better for a vacation and an opportunity to see new friends and new places. The physician in addition is given on such occasions the advantage of seeing many of his old professional friends and of coming in contact, and becoming acquainted, with many other men of aspirations similar to his own.

THE NEED OF COMMON-SENSE IN MEDICAL PRACTICE.

Some years ago, about 1377, I think it was, a predecessor of mine practicing surgery was constrained to write an address on "Ye Manere of Ye Leche." This, by the way, was not a treatise on the abstraction of blood in inflammation, as you might infer, but an essay on the proper behavior and conduct of a physician.

The production of John Arderne, written about hundred years before the discovery of San Salvador, contains much that I would say to you. My first impulse was to read his words as my own production; but I was deterred by the thought that the Latin requirement of this College insured your detecting the flavor of medievalism. I shall be content with giving you some of his advice in the language of an early translator:

"Ffirst it behoueth hym that wil profite in this crafte, that he sette God afore euermore in alle his werkis and euermore calle mekely with hert and mouth his help. * * * * And abstene he hym fro moche speche, and most among grete men. * * * * Also be a leche no*ght* mich laughyng ne mich playing. * * * * Haue the leche also clene handes, and well shapen nailez and clensed fro all blaknes and filthe."

What necessary attributes of a surgeon? Trust in God—self-restraint in deportment—finger nails free from germs.

I hear you whisper, "Ah! but those precepts of the fourteenth century teacher were not meant for the nineteenth century woman doctor. He knew no woman physician; and, moreover, she it is that does 'abstene fro

moche speche' and 'be no*ght* mich laughyng ne mich playing.'" Be not so sure of his want of acquaintance with you; for in a certain document, dated as early as 1389, occurs a distinct reference to women practising surgery in London.

Moreover, while our ancient surgeon was living in London, Richard II. became King of England; and it was during his reign that the poet wrote:

> Twa maydens with him thai left,
> That wele war lered of lechecraft;
> The lordes doghters both thai wore
> That war left to kepe hym thore,
> Thai heled him everilka wound.

If any further evidence is needed that John of Arderne wrote his address for the ears of women practitioners, call to mind that the wounded Sir Tristram, whose deeds are told in the "Morte d'Arthur," went to Ireland where the king "made Trystram to be put in his doughter's ward and kepyng, by cause she was a noble surgeon. And when she had serched him she fond in the bottome of his wound that therein was poyson, and soo she heled hym within a whyle."

Ireland, in truth, has always been chivalrous to women; and at a later period than the composition of the tales of Arthur, we find in the Charter of the Barber Surgeons of the City of Dublin (1446) that this Guild for the promotion and exercise of the art of chirurgery was to consist of "men as well as women." Mark the phrase "men as well as women." The men were seemingly admitted as an appendage or corollary to the women.

Having thus proved that my author's words were meant for you, I shall let him speak concerning your conduct in the sick-room and of the confidential nature of your profession.

"Also it spedeth that a leche kanne talke of gode

talez and of honest that may make the pacientes to laugh, as wele of the biblee as of other tragediez and any other thingis of whiche it is no*gh*t to charge whilez that they make or induce a li*gh*t hert to the pacient or the sike man. Diseouer nuer the leche vnwarly the counsellez of his pacientez als wele of men as of wymmen no sette no*gh*t oon to another at no*gh*t, thof al he haue eause that he be no*gh*t gilty of counsell, ffor *yi*f a man se ye hede wele a nother mannes counsel he will wist better in ye."

He, who wrote these lines five centuries ago, was imbued with the true spirit of the physieian. His surgical writings, too, show that he was no servile follower of tradition, but a thoughtful, eompetent, self-reliant doctor. He had that rare gift of God—common-sense. Laek of this rare gift is the souree of many professional failures. Knowledge of anatomy, chemistry, therapeuties, and the "ologies" is certainly requisite for true success in medieine; but unless the graduate have common-sense, all these are vain. Much of the ridicule east upon medicine springs from a publie recognition of the absence of common-sense in the lives of many medieal practitioners. A mental attitude of ealm eonsideration and a judicious aetion, never over-enthusiastie or unduly eonservative, are imperatively demanded of him who essays to direet Nature's physiological proeesses. A sueeessful genius may be a fool, but a sueessful physician never.

I beg you to remember above all things that it is your patient that is to be treated and not the disease. Some praetitioners seem to retain the idea, whieh before they began medieal study they possessed in common with the public, that eaeh disease is an entity, whieh must be combated with a specifie remedy. This belief, born of ignorance, assumes that the first duty of the physieian is to give a name to the disease afflicting his elient; the

second to select from the drug-shop labels a ready-made curative medicine. Such physicians fail to realize that the practice of medicine consists in so directing vital processes that the perturbations, due to disease, may be lessened and finally replaced by the normal functions of health. A doctor must necessarily study at first the pathological changes underlying and causing the symptoms; he then gives a distinctive name to the disease, just as a man does to his child, not to select the remedy by which to neutralize its evil powers, but for use as a distinguishing mark. The wise physician knows, for example, that one patient with pneumonia will be killed by blood-letting; that another with the same disease will die if it be omitted. The judicious practitioner examines circulation, respiration, digestion, secretions and nervous system, and prescribes to bring aberrant tissue and organs into normal activity. He will, perhaps, give the same drug in a case of pneumonia, peritonitis, scarlet fever, or broken leg, because the patient's condition is more important than the name of the affection.

Do not think I undervalue the studies carried on by the investigator in diseased structures, whom we call the pathologist. You must all be pathologists, so as to be able to examine circulation, digestion, secretions and nervous system. What I am trying to impress upon you is that he is an unsafe physician who, after giving a name to a disease always treats that disease with the same powder, potion or surgical appliance. This will be clear when I remind you that one case of typhoid fever may be as different from another as inflammation of the brain is from mere physical fatigue. The safe rule of practice is the common-sense rule: "Find out what is the matter with your patient, then treat him for his individual condition." No physician can treat disease successfully without attention to the physiological characteristics of the person affected.

Let me adjure you to avoid the quackish practice of frightening your patients with high-sounding Latin or Greek names for unimportant ailments. A woman may be scared into hysterics by being told of "hemorrhage" from a pin's scratch. Call it "bleeding," and she will give it no thought. Threats of "typhoid fever" and of "gastritis" may bring dollars into the pocket of the physician; but such tricks belong to the unscrupulous. Not very different, however, is the course of him who, because of a great reputation, charges the sick enormous fees, knowing that fear of death always assists the highwayman in the process of extortion.

It requires little time for the public to recognize the trait which I have called common-sense, and its recognition is soon followed by obedience to its medical possessor. See to it that your patients are obedient. If you accept the responsibility, you have a right to demand implicit obedience to all medical advice founded on science and common-sense. Gain the confidence of your clients by knowledge and honesty, and keep it by insisting upon their hearty cooperation. A patient never trusts a doctor who takes him into consultation. Many well-educated physicians have starved by reason of a fatal want of self-trust inducing them to make consultants of their patients.

A word of caution about remedies of hidden composition may not be out of place. Put little faith in the asseverations of those whose sole interest in human woe is the money accruing from man's desire to escape sickness and death. Pliny was right in reproving the physicians of the first century for buying from the Seplasiarii medicines of whose components they were ignorant. It is not in accord with the dictates of commonsense to risk your patient's safety by giving an unknown compound—perhaps inactive, perhaps deleterious—be-

cause the seller vaunts its virtues in large type and with voluminous documents.

Do not forget that even the educated may give worthless evidence concerning matters out of touch with their chosen pursuits. The eloquent divine may be honestly in error when he attributes the disappearance of his gout to the bracelet on his wrist, forgetting the efficacious horse-chestnut put in his pocket months before. His evidence as to the comparative value of medicine is scarcely more convincing.

Have the good judgment to put little faith in the certificates, signed by physicians, which are scattered abroad by makers of proprietary remedies and by venders of manufactured and natural waters. Many of these recommendations are forgeries; others are obtained from physicians who will sign almost any paper presented to them. As scientific evidence such certificates are usually worthless. Never sell your own names to such purposes, whether the consideration given be friendship, patronage or a box of neatly packed samples.

Much of your practice will be among women, notoriously liable to symptoms dependent upon a disordered nervous system. In treating them, even more than in treating men, it is essential that the physician ever bear in mind the nervous element. Bring the unbalanced mind into subjection, and the cure will often be easy. Common-sense is here the key to success. Patient investigation will show absence of serious structural disease, and firm but gentle management will bring brilliant cure. No temporizing policy is permissible in this instance; no fatal compromise may be made with the indiscriminate use of opiates or sedatives. The physician must have the iron hand in the velvet glove. Considerate tenderness, unbending honesty and a rigid discipline will bring the doctor who dares the patient's ire absolute obedience, faithful affection and unbounded

gratitude. This sort of a physician has the spirit of the old field-marshal whose motto reads: *Erst wägen, dann wagen*—first weigh, then dare.

It is the part of caution and common-sense to prescribe narcotics as little as possible, and to see to it that your patient is not informed of the administration of these seductive drugs. Many hapless opium-users and alcoholics can date their moral degradation to the garrulity of the doctor or nurse. The use of these medicines is sometimes imperative, but often a less powerful remedy will be efficacious if combined with tact and common-sense. A wise old writer testifies that a certain "untoothsome composition" was "admirably well suited to the intention of an hysterick," and such can often be found, which will be of use to-day.

It has been truly said that the medical profession is not one for untrained hearts and feeble brains, because it demands the devotion of a lifetime, the possession of ability, and a training which only the amplest opportunities can insure. The responsibilities put upon a doctor are somewhat similar to those assumed by the clergy, and the daily dependence of life upon the judicious character of his acts makes his function full of anxiety and care. No citizen has more capacity for rendering service to the State and his fellow-men than the educated physician. His special knowledge of the secrets of the human laboratory and his intimate acquaintance with the peculiarities of human nature give him incalculable power over the destinies of individuals.

We, your instructors, have endeavored to teach you the science of medicine—medicine founded on physical and physiological truth: and in that effort have aimed to show you how to observe and how to think. All the resources of science are to be pressed into your service. In the selection of methods of treatment, in the choice of drugs and their doses, you are bound to no authority,

sect or dogma. You are at liberty to use the infinitesimal dose or the tangible pill; the remedy obtained from the vegetable kingdom, or that of mineral origin; the so-called current of the electrician, or the hypnotic influence of the strong over the weak mind. You are neither allopath, homœopath, electropath nor hydropath. You are simply physicians, whose educated hands must draw upon every department of mental and physical science in the attempt to relieve and cure. Your teachers only ask that you prove all things and hold fast that which is good. Let your practice be founded on common-sense and conscience, and then no folly, no evil, can be justly laid at your door.

You have to-day received your diplomas from a medical college that for years has required more months of attendance on lectures and laboratory work than any other medical school in this great State of Pennsylvania, a State noted for the excellence of its medical institutions. It is gratifying to tell you that in October of next year will be inaugurated the compulsory four years' course, requiring your successors to attend four annual courses of graded medical lectures before being eligible for the degree of Doctor of Medicine. This advance and the additional requirements in the entrance examination show you that the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania intends to be ever in the vanguard, and that you need have no fear of your alma mater debauching the profession by lowering the standard of medical education.

The Corporators and Faculty need, however, your help—the help of all the alumnæ—to increase the endowment of the school, that additional opportunities for clinical study and for laboratory work may be provided, and that a healthy mind in a healthy body may be obtained by a systematic and scientific physical training in a well-conducted College gymnasium.

My words may convey to you the impression that the life upon which you now enter is not an easy one. It is true. The daily work of a doctor is hard, but it is one full of deepest satisfaction. In the words of Canon Liddon, physicians "have some part of their reward, at any rate, in a homage which neither wealth nor birth can possibly command." The knowledge of your usefulness to the public and of your ability to aid and support those in sorrow and despair is a thing that cannot be taken from you.

Worldly success, too, is sure to come to the educated, earnest, reliable doctor. An example is seen in that physician of whom a distinguished writer has recently said: "He owed our unbounded trust not to his intellect, which was not highly originative or fitted for profound research, but to a singular balance of mental and moral qualifications. Novelties neither too much tempted nor too much repelled him. He was intellectually very honest. * * * * I never knew a man who seemed to me to live his professional life on higher levels of that common-sense which in its perfection is so uncommon."

Compare this quotation, giving the most valuable characteristics of the successful modern physician, with what our author of the fourteenth century tells us of "Ye Manere of Ye Leche:" and you will see that success and reputation depend now, as then, upon much the same traits.

An even older writer tells us "in quietness and confidence shall be your strength." First weigh, then dare, —and the esteem and commendation of your fellows, and the approval of your own consciences will follow the recognition of duty nobly done.

Time, however, will not allow me to dwell on my theme, for "many thingis forsothe bêne to be kept of a leche withonte these that ar seid afore that may no*gh*t be noted here for ouer moche occupying."

THE NECESSITY FOR PHYSICIANS' AID ASSOCIATIONS.

The Directors have put me upon the program to address you upon the necessity of mutual aid associations, which shall render assistance to disabled physicians and to the families of physicians who have died without leaving provision for their wives and children. It is scarcely possible that any physician here to-night is unacquainted with the urgent need for such an organization; but there are those present, not of the profession, who may be surprised to hear that the practice of medicine is not a lucrative vocation. No one can begin the practice of medicine without having previously spent a good deal of money in obtaining his technical education; nor can he begin his work until he has at least reached his majority. Those entering upon a commercial career can earn a certain amount of income, even though it be small, without several years of study, and before the age of twenty-one years. A young doctor, moreover, starts in life burdened by the cost of the necessary books and instruments. Then, too, the doctor has to keep up the appearance of success, for few will employ a physician who wears shabby clothing and has a dilapidated home, showing upon the surface his inefficiency. Is one likely to employ a physician who is known to have few patients? A feeling of charity may occasionally impel a man to employ a mechanic who is in need of work, but few of us would place our own bodies in the care of a doctor evidently trusted by few clients. Thus it is that the necessity of maintaining decent appearances prevents on the part of a doctor that economy which in other cases is so commendable.

Another contributing factor to the limited income of a physician is the fact that practically all the work must be done by his own hands and brain; he cannot appoint clerks to assist him or delegate the routine business to another. The sick person who calls a physician wants the physician for whom he sends, and will accept another only grudgingly and for but a short time. When we consider that the day is but twenty-four hours long and that much of this time is needed for sleep and refreshment, we appreciate the impossibility of one person carrying on a large business without help.

Then, also, the sense of propriety prevents a physician publishing a claim to superior ability in the manner permissible to merchants calling attention to the goods which they have for sale.

I was recently struck by the provision of the corporation of Barber-Surgeons in London, which, in 1307, forbade its members putting blood in their windows as an advertisement of the skill. This shows the objection to professional advertisement even in those early days. It holds equally good at the present time; for of little professional standing are the dentists who put extracted teeth in their windows, or the doctors who fill their windows or offices with tapeworms and tumors preserved in bottles of alcohol.

The public does not realize the fact that the physician cannot avoid doing a great deal of professional work for which he never receives compensation. No educated man is so directly and personally employed by the very poor. The clergyman in administering to the poor of his parish receives an indirect recompence from the wealthier class of parishioners who pay his salary. The doctor, however, is directly employed by the indigent from whom he must receive his fee if he is paid at all. The result is that the professional remuneration

received from the poor is totally inadequate for the work done.

Sir James Paget, in investigating the subsequent career of graduates of one of the London medical schools, found that twenty-five per cent. of them had left the medical profession for more luerative employment. In this country, Dr. W. R. Hubbert reports that of 100 of his medical friends nearly 75 per cent. had, after graduation, entered other callings to add to their income; becoming real estate agents, book canvassers, etc., as well as practitioners. Dr. Thurston found that 175 different practices advertised for sale in the Lancet had an average income of only $625 per year. When it is considered that the income in each case was the gross receipts of the practice offered for sale, and was estimated by one who would be anxious to make the best showing possible, it can readily be understood how poorly the average doctor is paid for his services. It has been estimated that the average income of all the medical men in England, who actually work in their profession and have no other revenue is $1,000 a year. A writer in the *London Quarterly Review* says that there are in England not a few competent practitioners of great ability and industry who, although willing to undertake anything honorable, do not receive $500 a year. The same author says it is probable that hardly one medical man in forty rises to a position of professional eminence and social dignity. I am quite sure that these statistics, though at first appalling, will upon second thought, be recognized by us all as holding good in this country. It is, therefore, the duty of every member of the Philadelphia County Medical Society to consider the propriety of becoming a member of the Mutual Aid Association, not because he feels he may need assistance from his colleagues during his life, or after his death for his family, but because of the help required by his needy brothers. I cannot, it

seems to me, do a better thing than urge you to become members of the Mutual Aid Association this evening, and to see your attorneys as early as possible to-morrow and insert in your will a legacy, even though small, for this object.

While looking over some books lately I was greatly interested by the provision made in earlier times for organizations of this character. For instance, in the time of Richard II., about 1387, the Corporation of Barber-Surgeons in London adopted a series of ordinances or regulations which correspond with what we now know as by-laws. I read from this slip of paper a translation from the Norman-French of one of these ordinances. It is noticeable that it is the first of the ordinances, and not the second, third or fourth. It reads as follows:

Firstly, to the honor of God and all his saints, and to stir up the Commons to do well, and to have the perseverance in well doing, it is ordained that if any brother of the Fraternity who has been of this Fraternity for seven years by chance fall into trouble or into poverty, and if he have nothing of his own by which he may be able to live, and it be not through his own folly, that then he shall have each week from the common box tenpence halfpenny for his sustenance.

At a still later period the following paragraph is found in the regulations for the government of the Guild of Surgeons. This Guild, it must be remembered, was contemporary with the Corporation of Barber-Surgeons, and at one time united with it, so that we, the descendants of English stock, may consider ourselves as being a sort of posterity to these two old surgical organizations of Great Britain. The following regulation was made in 1435 for the government of the Guild of Surgeons:

Also it is ordeined and assentid in this composicioun that eueri Cirurgian of the fellowschipe in the craft of Cirurgie to paie iid a quarter to the box that is viii a year to the profit

and worschip of the craft in helping and releuying the nede of pore men of the saim felowschipe.

The greater value of the English penny at the time these sums were furnished the poor brothers of the Fraternity made the assistanee of a real one.

In order to show the value of even a small legaey which I trust you are going to put in your wills to-morrow for the benefit of this Assoeiation, I wish to point out to you the result of sueh legacy by Robert Ferbras, citizen and Barber-Surgeon of London in 1470, who gave or bequeathed (it is not eertain whether it was given before his death or left in his will) two freehold houses in the Parish of St. John to the Company in trust to divide one moiety of the surplus receipts, after the repairs, among poor members of the Corporation of Barber-Surgeons in London. This provision made over four hundred years ago is to this day distributed by the officers of the eorporation among twenty-eight members and their widows. Do you not, therefore, see the amount of good that can be accomplished if each member of this Society will do as did the barber-surgeon in the fifteenth eentury, whose name otherwise would probably have been lost to us. I have made these quotations to show that even in the earliest times professional men found that the ineome derived from practice was not to be depended upon, that they knew it was a voeation bringing in no large remuneration, and that a warm feeling for their colleagues compelled them to do what lay in their power for those members of their profession who fell into peeuniary distress and left their families without a proper ineome.

A BREACH OF TRUST—THE PHYSICIANS' USE OF SECRET REMEDIES.

The trust and confidence in physicians shown by the public is phenomenal. A woman will bring her baby to a doctor, whom she may never have seen before, and permit him to prescribe for it, knowing that upon his judgment, knowledge and care depends its very life. Men and women of the highest culture and intellectual power will place their lives, aye their honor, dearer than life, in the custody of an anæsthetist and an operator, of whom they know little.

Can a higher compliment be paid to a profession than this? It must be remembered that it is the knowledge that we are physicians, which gives rise to this unusual faith in our integrity, our wisdom, our skill. None but the thoughtless doctor can fail to be thrilled, when he realizes to what a pinnacle of virtue the repute of his calling has raised him. Perhaps it is the familiarity with this attitude of the public, which makes us a little dull in appreciating the responsibility, which its docile trust imposes. It at least must drive an honest man to a soul-stirring endeavor to play fair with his patients.

While it is true that some essayists and novelists have occasionally written disparagingly of medical men, it has, as a rule, been their foibles that have been smiled or railed at rather than their altruism for their patients. The words of thoughtful observers will seldom fail to confirm what I have said as to the prevalent opinion concerning physicians. It, therefore, behooves the present generation of doctors to maintain the honor of medicine by justifying this trust in its votaries.

Recent events in commercial and political life have exposed astonishing breaches of trust in high stations. Lapses from the kind of integrity supposed to be general have shaken faith in insurance circles, in the transportation business and in financial enterprises. The result has been economic distress and almost universal distrust.

The primal duty of one who offers himself as a healer of the sick and injured is to know what he is doing. He needs to use his mind to discover the cause of the illness, and to apply his knowledge to furnishing the means of relief. Hence he must see to it that neither ignorance of medical progress, nor a mind befuddled with drugs, nor the secret composition of his remedies makes him unfit to be trusted with human life. Such deficiencies on his part rob his clients of what they have a right to expect, and lessen the honor in which the profession of medicine has long been held. A physician who puts an unknown dose of an unknown poison into the circulation of his trusting patient is worse than a quack. He commits a breach of trust as surely as the financier, who fills his own pockets by selling worthless securities, or the guardian who cheats his ward out of his patrimony.

For a number of years the public respect for the medical profession has been in danger; because some credence has been given to rumors of secret division of fees, acceptance of bribes, and other breaches of trust, such as that under discussion. My observation has proved that such practises are indulged in by those from whom the public has a right to expect better things.

Sensational newspapers have disseminated the notion that physicians are willing to deliberately kill the sick, for whom they have no cure. A recent novel by a woman of great ability seems to indicate that she believes that a trained nurse, who is sane, will murder a

desperately ill patient entrusted to her care. The insult to physicians and trained nurses conveyed in these publications is a result of some of our own misdoings. The damage done to public confidence in these essentials of modern civilization by such opinions is perhaps as widespread as the loss of financial stability due to recent knavery in business.

The cure for the nostrum evil is the inculcation by medical teachers of the maxims of Hippocrates and their own discontinuance of prescribing secret preparations, the use of the Pharmacopœia as a text-book in medical schools, the immediate emptying of samples of secret nostrums into the sewers, a better education in therapeutics, and an insistence that the prescriber of secret nostrums is a dangerous quack, who commits an actual breach of trust.

SOME CAUSES OF INEFFICIENCY IN MEDICAL PRACTICE.

Lack of Equipment for Prompt Service. The patriot desirous of saving his country was told to trust in the Lord and keep his powder dry. The physician anxious to serve, and perchance save, his patient should see that he always has professional tools with him. A clinical thermometer, a hypodermic syringe, a lead pencil, a pocket case of instruments, and a few powerful medicinal tablets are as needful to him as the dry powder to the soldier. A doctor who has to send for his spectacles or any other necessities of his calling, before he can relieve agony, or save life, would better be a plumber or carpenter. Such mechanics are notorious for returning to the shop for tools before they can begin to stop a leak or mend a chair.

Carelessness in Observation. Many mistakes in diagnosis and treatment are attributable to hurried and careless examination. It is an inefficient doctor who tells a short-breathed patient that he has asthma, when the urine has not been analyzed and the chest not auscultated. More than once have I found a temperature rise, after a surgical operation, improperly attributed to sepis in the wound; because the medical attendant had not been alert enough to examine the lungs for a pneumonia. On the other hand, I have come near remaining in ignorance of an important temperature rise, due to sepsis, because a nurse accidentally omitted one day's temperature readings from the official chart. An efficient practitioner must not only watch the symptoms of the patient, but the actions and records of the nurse and family.

He must ever be keen-eyed, open-eared, and wide-awake; even then some important detail may occasionally escape his notice. Doctors, therefore, can not afford to have their intellectual acuity blunted by beer, tobacco, or unnecessary loss of sleep. A successful medical career demands accuracy and eternal vigilance.

Indefiniteness in Giving Orders. Attendants on the sick should be given directions as to medication, diet and hygiene with definiteness and clearness. Much harm has often occurred from misunderstood or indefinite orders and carelessly written prescriptions. It is a constant wonder to me that many resident physicians in hospitals write so execrably and spell so originally. Even bachelors of arts and of science lack efficiency in these regards. To write nitrate of bismuth so that it looks like nitrobenzol, or to abbreviate codein so that it looks like calomel, is not good practice, even if the nurse or apothecary is able to know what is intended. Death may result from such mistaken orders. To kill a man by bursting his intestine with a large enema given by hydrostatic pressure from a high level is a professional tragedy, which may occur from lack of definite instructions to a subordinate. A child may be scalded to death by putting it into an overheated bath. An infant may be drowned by leaving it alone in a tub of water, where it may fall on its face. These calamities have happened.

Want of Self-Confidence and Tact. Repose, as of conscious power, and the modest but confident voice of self-reliance are mighty aids to successful control of the sick. Vacillation in opinion, frequent change of medicine, and ineffectual command of the situation from want of tact are bad in the sick room. They are soon followed by a lack of confidence in the ability of the physician, similar to that seen among soldiers with an inefficient captain. Many men with medical knowledge fail to be successful practitioners because they have not

the bearing of effectiveness. As a horse feels through the bit the character of the driver, so the keen invalid may know the character of his doctor by seeing him enter the room.

Failure to Appreciate the Value of Common Remedies. Clean air, clean water, clean food and sound sleep, though the cheapest of all remedies, are the most neglected. It has taken many years to teach doctors and laymen that even tuberculosis of the lungs may be cured by these agencies. Many other affections are much alleviated and even cured by their employment. Several hours in the open air may conquer a restlessness that bromids and other nervines do not abate. A few glasses of water may wash out the kidneys and empty the bowels in a more satisfactory way than an official diuretic or laxative. Proper food and a good night's sleep may be of more benefit than the medical tyro's stimulants and tonics given to control depression or shock. Why compel a patient to swallow a diuretic pill when a cup of coffee may be more agreeable and equally effective? Why depend on massage, Swedish movements, and bitter tonics given in a curtained bed, in an over-heated room, in a dark unventilated house, when Providence has supplied clean air, clean water, and a chance for bodily exercise in the fields and on the house tops. It is better to scrub the back yard with a broom and hang out the wash on a flat, than to depend on a masseur for exercise and the druggist for one's appetite. Have we not all seen patients nearly smother with antiseptic fumigations, recommended by wily advertisers, when it was the sunshine, the air, the water, obtainable at little cost, that were needed to hasten cure? Why give oxygen occasionally instead of fresh air all the time?

Loss of sleep probably retards convalescence more often than is usually recognized. I have saved drugs

and given healthy slumber by simply ordering a patient to smoke his customary tobacco, which hospital rules had prohibited. One of my hernia patients spent many sleepless nights after operation, until I discovered that in health he always slept on his abdomen. I ordered him to do so again, and he at once slept deeply. I believe that some of our cases of postoperative insanity and hysteria are due to our failure to recognize the vital importance of sleep. The doctor often leaves his patient in the hands of an attendant or nurse and does not have opportunity to estimate the mental strain of vigil occurring night after night. Bathing, shutting out noises by plugging the ears, using single beds, sleeping on roofs or porches or with the head stuck out of a window, and similar expedients will often be sufficient to induce sleep. If they fail, drugs so employed as to avoid habituation may be required. Do not forget that strychnin, given as a stimulant and tonic, is often the cause of sleeplessness.

Insufficient Doses of Medicines. Do not think that I am opposed to medicinal agents, because I urge the use of plain remedies and the exercise of common sense. I believe in drugs, when drugs are needed; and I believe in giving efficient doses. Nothing seems so fatuous as playing with drugs in insufficient doses. When one desires to divide skin or muscle, one needs a knife that will cut. So also when one needs a drug, it must be pure, it must have power. The physician must know not only what he is giving, but how much. Besides this he must have courage to give enough.

Chloral, potassium bromid, mercury, potassium iodid, codein sulphate, and hyoscin hydrobromate are a few of the valuable drugs frequently given in insufficient doses. Much of the vaunted value of secret nostrums (the disgrace of the present era) comes from their use by ignorant and careless practitioners, who unwittingly

give larger doses of well-known remedies than when they prescribe the same remedies in official preparations. A man who would usually prescribe two grains of chloral may, unknown to himself, give ten grains of the same drug in a secret mixture. As a result his patient sleeps; and he, poor ignoramus, proclaims that "Soporifica" of the "Fraud Chemical Company" is superior to chloral of the United States Pharmacœpeia.

To try to put a patient to sleep with five grains of chloral and ten grains of potassium bromid, when he needs fifteen grains of one and forty of the other, is as useless as to hope to cure bone syphilis or brain syphilis with eighty or ninety grains of potassium iodid daily when the pathological condition demands eight or nine hundred grains a day. Codein sulphate as a hypnotic should be given hypodermically in doses of from one to two grains. There need be little expectation of inducing sleep after operation by small doses. My usual prescription is codein sulphate, one and a half grains, with hyoscin hydrobromate, one fiftieth of a grain, given hypodermically a few hours after operation. This may be repeated in the course of a few hours, if the patient has pain or is restless. I mention these doses to show that I am not opposed to drugs, and that I believe in effectual medication when it is demanded by the symptoms.

The employment of drugs in medical practice should resemble the resort to surgery. The guiding principle should be: "No drugs and no surgery, unless necessary;" when necessary, "effective drugs and effective surgery."

THE NEEDS OF THIS HOUR.

The first requisite of successful action for improving the government of Philadelphia is a clear understanding of the source of our trouble. Some believe it to be the ignorant population, which votes without a just understanding of the duties of citizenship. Others think it to be the indifference of intelligent citizens, who fail to vote on election day. Still others say that the cause of our bad government is the wickedness of political bosses, who accept bribes, organize gangs of repeaters, and place corruptible puppets in election booths, the executive offices, City Councils, the State Legislature and on the Bench.

Intelligent students of the question know that the first cause is unimportant, and need attract very little attention from this organization.

The coming to the polls of all citizens who now neglect the opportunity to vote, would probably not overthrow the majority of the Republican machine in this city. The number of fraudulent names on the Assessors' lists of voters is estimated at from 50,000 to 80,000. This is a large number to overcome, and would be quickly increased by the adherents of Mr. Durham, at a mere hint from his lieutenants. Hence, this factor in the situation calls for no special action now, except insistence upon the necessity of reform in our election laws.

The third source, mentioned as the cause of Philadelphia's ills is the success of its political rulers in collecting bribes, carrying elections and controlling the occupants of legislative, executive and judicial positions. At

first glance, it would seem that this is indeed the true cause of the city's undoing. The public knows that bribes are accepted by the political captains, who rule over us. It knows that elections are carried by stuffed ballot-boxes, bogus voters coming from policemen's houses, repeaters traveling from one voting booth to another, and the subservience of judges. It sees that the members of Councils and of the Legislature, the Mayor, the City Treasurer, the Collector of Taxes, the Recorder, the Register of Wills, the District Attorney, the Judges and other officers are nominated and elected by these same active political leaders. What more is needed, it may say, to prove that the corrupt and expensive government of this town is due to the men who control affairs in City Hall?

Let me tell you, who expect to improve civic conditions by antagonizing and overthrowing the power of these leaders, that you have not begun to realize the real source of our political degradation. Those whom you call bosses and leaders are themselves the subjects of a higher influence, which controls them as they control the scrub-women, the speakeasies and the bawdy houses. Do you not remember the speech in the United States Senate, which put the dollar mark on the person of a political leader of this town? Mr. Quay told you then the source of Philadelphia's misgovernment; and showed the solution of the problem before this meeting.

Every thoughtful and observant man knows that it is the transportation and other corporations that rule this municipality. It is the bribe-giver, and not the bribe-taker, that you should pursue. From the beginning of time we have pitied Eve, the tempted, and cursed the serpent that tempted her. Shall we now curse the political leader and pity the directors of corporations who tempt him? Let me ask you who chooses the President of Select Council? Who the President of the Com-

mon Council? Who the Chairman of the Committees of Council? Who discusses with the political bosses, as you call them, aspirants for United States Senator? for Governor? for Justice? for Judge?

You don't see far, gentlemen, if you believe these selections are made in the Betz Building, uninfluenced by powers in the buildings to the west, to the north, to the east and to the south of City Hall.

The first step for this meeting, or its representatives, to take is to publish the names of the directors and officers of the companies, which are known to bribe influential politicians, councilmen and legislators, with stocks, rebates, money or passes. The second step is to call upon these eminent citizens of Philadelphia (for they are eminent in business, finance, science and religion), and tell them personally that they are the cause of their city's corrupt government, high taxes and large death rate from typhoid fever. The third step is to prove to them by interview, social pressure and business ostracism that all honest citizens despise their dishonorable and cowardly conduct; dishonorable, because they permit their executive agents to despoil the city, cowardly, because they shirk personal responsibility by hiding behind these agents and claim ignorance of wrongdoing.

I do not blame city officials for corrupt acts as much as do some; because I realize the pressure that the machine can bring to make them violate their oaths of office. Obedience to the organization or non-support of wives and children are the alternatives in many instances. I feel that the blame for our shameful civic condition is due less to the boss, who sell franchises and special privileges, than to the Boards of Directors, who buy them. Bribery cannot exist until a bribe-giver is found. Let this meeting seek out, exhibit, prosecute, and put in jail the bribe-givers, and it will not be long

before we shall have representative councilmen and honest political leaders.

The attempt to cure the evil of corrupt bosses and dishonest councilmen against the wishes of these corporations will be futile. It is like trying to stamp out the social evil by arresting a few pitiable street-walkers and private strumpets. The remedy for the latter is to attack and put to route the lecherous men, who debauch women; the remedy for the former is to train our guns on the dishonest citizens of "eminent respectability," who debauch officials. The fathers and mothers of the country could quickly diminish the social evil by denying men of immoral reputation entrance to their homes and association with their children. The citizens of Philadelphia can quickly diminish the political corruption of the day by similar treatment of the corporation managers of whatever wealth and influence, who tamper with the morality of political leaders and city officials.

It is to be hoped that the movement now started will be led by men who are not awed by names, by wealth or by influence, but who will get at the truth, despite the efforts of men of large vested interests to hide behind the coat-tails of so-called political bosses.

THE REAL CAUSE OF MUNICIPAL CORRUPTION.

Study of municipal ills shows that their origin is corporate greed, fostered by the personal selfishness and indifference of citizens. The temper of its citizens makes the social, commercial and political atmosphere of the municipality. This statement has concrete illustration in religious communities, such as the Shakers, Mennonites, Zionists and Mormons. If the people of St. Louis, Chicago, New York or Philadelphia were as earnest and unselfish in patriotism and honesty as are the inhabitants of Zion or Salt Lake City in Dowieism or Mormonism, there would be little opportunity for pinch bills, grafting or fraudulent elections in those cities.

It is claimed by many that corruption in a city is due to the stolid allegiance of partisan voters to national party, and that separation of municipal from state and national issues is the panacea. That this is fallacious is evident from the fact that state and national governments are as honeycombed with corruption as city councils. The unprejudiced observer will find the same deals, the same lobbies, the same bribery, the same corruption in Congress, in legislatures and in town councils.

Some superficial thinkers consider the impecunious and ignorant voter, who is bought by campaign funds, the factor which is to be eliminated to insure honest elections. They believe that cessation of political assessment of office-holders, prevention of sale of votes, and

disorganization of bands of paid repeaters would work a politieal millennium.

Those who hold this view see only the puppets and fail to reeognize the intelleetual and edueational strength whieh is required to effectively move them. Sueeessful political eorruption requires acumen, strategy, mental equipment and courage of the highest type. These qualities are not found in the ignorant classes, but are the characteristics of men of affairs.

It is neither the love of party nor the intelleetual defieiency of the vote-seller that permits the election frauds of the present day. These characteristics are not sufficient to drive the average citizen to spontaneous aetivity.

The basic causes of corrupt politics are personal selfishness and indifferenee to the rights of others. What cares the manufacturer for the economie prineiples of politieal parties, if he ean succeed in having a high tariff or a state license exclude competition? What matters it to the supplier of coal or petroleum how soon a rival corporation becomes bankrupt, if he can force a seeret rebate from the railroad, whieh carries the product of both? Does anybody believe that the ignorant voter, who sells his vote, is an unsolicited salesman? A much higher intelligence is needed to organize the systematie buying and selling of votes which elects judges, legislators and officers, and enaets laws. It demands for its success the same type of mind as is found in the captains of industry and the presidents of great corporations. The leaders of the corrupt political system of a city and the heads of the industrial and corporate enterprises, whieh are its pride, are often the same individuals. Hence is it so difficult to root out political vices. The men who are seen on the surfaee are not the real criminals. The latter are respected merchants, trusted bankers, successful manufacturers, envied doc-

tors, well-known lawyers, and even men of conspicuous religious habits, who hypocritically pose as, and pass for, honorable citizens.

The present interest taken in municipal affairs by patriotic citizens makes it necessary to consider this phase of the question. Much energy will be wasted and worthy enthusiasm will be cooled, if the attempts to reform Philadelphia, for instance, are restricted to the elimination of partisanship, the conviction of sellers of votes at twenty-five cents each, and the defeat of candidates of the machine for city offices.

The cure of city corruption would be almost instantaneous, if reform committees, citizens' unions and municipal leagues would secure evidence of bribery, bring to trial and secure conviction of the president and directors of a single large railroad or electric lighting company; or punish the officers of a bank or trust company that gives illegal interest to officials.

Such a course of action will necessarily require most astute detective service, the employment of legal counsel of the highest and most incorruptible character, and the expenditure of large sums of money. It must be admitted at the start that men who will bribe councils, legislatures, congressmen and courts will not hesitate to bribe the detectives and lawyers employed by any reform organization, which attempts to put in jail the leaders of society, the pillars of the church, the promotors of charity, and the skilful of the professions.

The influence and means of the political criminals of whom I speak are almost boundless; but they can be dragged down from their apparently secure positions, if courage, intelligence and integrity are reinforced by sufficient funds.

What is needed now is recognition of the fact that our bad government is due to the friends and associates of the members of this National Municipal League. The

ward leaders, the division workers and the poverty-stricken voters of the slums are merely the tools, with which our acquaintances rob us of our liberties and unnecessarily increase our taxes. Why try to convict of petty criminalities these unimportant persons? If they should perchance be convicted, they are willing to take the penalty of the law and receive reward, from our friends, for vicarious suffering.

It is no great inconvenience to such convicted ones to pay a fine, contributed by your financial and business colleagues for protection from personal disgrace. Even should they suffer imprisonment, they need not despair; for are they not taken care of with the contributions of powerful corporations, and, as soon as their enforced vacation at government expense is ended, are they not given a good job at a fair wage by your friends and mine?

It is well enough to work for the improvement of city charters, the systematizing of municipal accounts, personal registration of voters, a true Australian ballot, the defeat of unworthy candidates and the prevention of ballot frauds. These aims are worthy, but we must shoot at a higher mark. I hope to live to see a railroad president or two, three or four directors of public service corporations and a couple of lawyers or bank presidents landed in jail, notwithstanding the frantic efforts of high-priced lawyers and physicians to save them by legal technicalities and certificates of mental aberration.

We need not be entirely hopeless, because recent developments in St. Louis, on the Pacific Coast and elsewhere offset the gloom of the political situation in Philadelphia. Even there the public is slowly realizing that criticism has heretofore been aimed at the wrong persons. It has been blaming the bribe-takers instead of the bribe-givers; the "hush-money" handlers instead of the "hush-money" raisers; the political servants of the

corporations instead of the directors of banks, hospitals, railroads and public utility corporations who employ them. The first state that enacts a law to punish the bribe-giver and to allow the bribe-taker, who gives effective evidence, to go free, will be the first commonwealth to have good city governments.

The difficulty in obtaining honest political conduct is the want of self-respect and honesty in the bulk of citizens. A notable absence of independence in thought and action seems to be characteristic of our present civilization. Men subordinate fundamental ethical principles to successful accomplishment. Any action whose illegality or immorality can be successfully concealed is safe and therefore worthy of adoption.

The motto upon which we fix our eyes is: "Nothing succeeds like success." Business men argue that acts are not to be condemned unless they are illegal under federal or state law; ministers contend that money may be used to convert the pagan without consideration as to the manner in which it was obtained by the donor; memorial churches may be built with ill-gotten gains; consulting surgeons may give, and family physicians may accept, secret commissions for "steering" patients to the operating-room, and lawyers may conduct suits for personal injury for a percentage of the amount obtained.

Many men seem to no longer remember that ethics and morals are older than statute law, and that even boys have been punished for an unsatisfactory answer to the question: "Where did you get it?" It is at least possible that a lawyer who has packed one jury to acquit a political offender may pack another to give a big verdict against a railroad company and thus increase his 40 per cent. contingent fee. It is credible that a doctor might prefer to direct his patients to an unskilled operator, who paid 30 per cent., than to a more skilful one who considered such secret commissions dis-

honorable. *Life's* method of telling which of two rich men had the most money, by observing with whom the Bishop first shook hands, is evidently the result of competent observation.

The real cause of political corruption, then, is corporate bribery. This is made possible by men's love of gain and power, and their desire to be business or social magnates. The standard of life seems to be not worth, but success and notoriety. The wish to imitate those with more means or more influence stimulates the lust for money. The simple life has no attractions, when our neighbors lead the high life. It takes money to do things that count in the vulgar estimate, and gold must therefore be obtained at any sacrifice of principle. The man who puts a bill through the city council or the state legislature is the man who gets results; and he is therefore successively agent, manager, secretary, director, vice-president and president of his corporation. The wife whose husband is successful in the financial sense becomes a local magnate in many feminine circles. His standard of business and professional ethics need not concern her any more than it does him. He is a captain of industry, of finance or of transportation. She and her daughters, in ball costume, have their photographs reproduced in the newspapers for the accommodation of any vulgar reader. What matters it, if the husband's name is a byword for chicanery; what if the portrait of their daughter adorns the wall of a student's room or a saloon, hanging between that of the popular ballet-dancer and the last champion of the prize-ring?

It is the indifference to the finer sensibilities and this love of money with its coincident vulgar display that are back of the struggle for success. Worldly success is often the sole key to financial and social advancement. Hence corporate success must be obtained, even by bribery. Bribes by corporations make political rottenness.

Political rottenness makes for most of us taxes high, streets unclean, water unfit to drink, disease rife, death common, and condemnation in the next world fairly certain. Corporate greed and personal vulgarity are the chief causes of municipal corruption.

Political liberty must, therefore be obtained by attacking bribery and graft in its high seats. We must bring down the big game, and at the same time inculcate in ourselves a respect for honesty and a disregard for the mere outward symbols of wealth and power.

THE HOPELESSNESS OF HONEST ELECTIONS IN PHILADLPHIA UNDER THE PRESENT LAWS AND WITH THE PRESENT COURTS.

Dear Sir:—Your recent efforts to show the fraudulent character of the assessors' lists of qualified voters in Philadelphia may be a surprise to many of your readers; but it is no news to any one, who has looked into election matters during recent years.

I am convinced that there is no hope of honest elections in this city, unless we can obtain better election laws or less timid judges. With good election laws and our present judges the elections might be made honest. With the present laws it is possible that we could have honest elections, if the judges were fearless.

I base these opinions on my personal experiences. I may say in passing that I am a Republican, and have been an earnest believer in the basic principles of the Republican party since boyhood. These prineiples I understand to have been, and to be, abolition of slavery, political equality of the negro, protective tariff, centralization of authority in the federal government, the gold standard, and the merit system in civil service appointments. I am, however, no believer in the Republican party's dishonest elections in this city.

During the past ten years, I have, as a member of the Municipal League, served many times as watcher at the polls. For the election of Nov. 4, 1902, I was appointed an overseer of elections by the Court of Common Pleas, No. 3. I live in the fifth division of the eighth

ward, which includes portions of Chestnut, Sansom and Walnut streets and parts of the north and south streets from Eleventh to Seventeenth Streets.

There have been to my knowledge at least 53 bogus names on the assessor's list in this division; which at the present time has 277 names returned as those of qualified voters. Many of these names appear on the list year after year; and many persons claiming to be so named, have been challenged by me at the polls. The only result has been that in nearly every case some one has sworn that the person claiming the right to vote was really so entitled and the judge of election has thereupon accepted his ballot. It has not been uncommon for a man, whom I knew to be voting illegally, to vote despite my challenge; and then be permitted to vouch for a lot of men whom also I knew to be illegal voters. It is probable that all of them were repeaters and known to be such to the election officers. The law unhappily allows a man to vote if a previous voter swears that he has resided in such and such a house in the division for two months. This is a grave defect in the election laws.

In the houses at which the several election officers claim residences, there are generally an unusual number of voters registered. Some of these names I believe to be bogus; and I have had pretty good evidence that some of the judges of election have themselves not even resided in the division as required by law. You may reply by asking why I have not insisted that the assessor strike the names, known to me to be fraudulent, from the list. To this I answer that I have tried to have this done. On one occasion I called on Robert Bates, the assessor at the time, and formally demanded that he show me his original list. This he refused to. I reported his refusal to the legal department of the Municipal League, but it was believed that nothing could be

satisfactorily accomplished by pushing my claim to see it.

On September 2, 1902, I prepared a list of 53 names which were known to be improperly on the assessor's list. I addressed a letter to John L. Lynch, then the assessor, citing these names and requesting that they be stricken from the list of voters, in accordance with the Act of 1891. I took this letter to the poll, 102 S. Thirteenth Street, on the day and during the hours when the law requires Mr. Lynch to be there for the purpose of hearing objections to names on his list. He was not there; but his son a policeman was found in the barroom, where the poll is located and said that he would take my letter for the assessor. To this I objected and said I desired to see Lynch, the assessor, not Lynch, the policeman. It was agreed that if I returned later, I would find him there. I returned, but he was not to be seen. One of the bartenders told me that he had not seen Lynch there at all.

Although I had taken a witness with me to establish my testimony as to these matters, the legal advisers of the Municipal League thought it useless under the present laws to take any steps against Mr. Lynch for dereliction of duty.

After these experiences, I succeeded in being appointed by the Court of Common Pleas an overseer of elections, foolishly thinking that if a watcher could do nothing to stop fraudulent votes by repeaters, perhaps an overseer, a quasi-official of the court, could.

An overseer is appointed by the court "to supervise the proceedings of election officers" and "to make report of the same as they may be required by said court." Overseers have the right "to challenge any person offering to vote, and interrogate him and his witnesses under oath, in regard to his right of suffrage * * * * and the officers of said election are required to afford

said overseers, so elected and appointed, every convenience and facility for the discharge of their duties; and if said election officers shall refuse to permit said overseers to be present, and perform their duties as aforesaid, such officer or officers shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be fined not exceeding one thousand dollars or undergo imprisonment not exceeding one year or both." The election returns are certified to by the signature of the overseers.

At the election of November 4, 1902, I served as such officer. The frauds were so obvious, and the judge of election prevented so efficiently my interrogating men, whom I knew were illegally voting, that I refused to sign the election returns. I then wrote to Messrs. M. J. Pickering and John Cadwalader, Jr., the gentlemen in charge of such matters for the fusion ticket, a letter from which I make the following abstracts:

The illegal action of the election officers was such that radical steps should be taken to secure their arrest and conviction. If it is possible under the present laws of Pennsylvania to restrain fraud at elections, it would seem as if the evidence which I can now give ought to be sufficient to lead to definite results in the way of punishing offenders against those laws. I, therefore, ask that you take such steps as are legally proper and necessary to arrest the judge of election, John Reardon, who claims to live at 1615 Sansom Street, for:

1. Refusing to certify to my affirmation as overseer.

2. Accepting illegal votes.

3. Interfering with the overseer in the discharge of his duties.

4. Rejecting legal ballots during the count.

5. Permitting Mr. Robert K. Idler to remain in the room after the poll was closed.

6. Permitting policeman No. 560 and others to be in the election booth during the election, and

7. General neglect of duty.

I also ask that the inspectors, Edward Hasson, 1628 Sansom Street, and Patrick Kelly, 1608 Ionic Street, be arrested for:

1. Aeeepting illegal votes.
2. Rejecting legal ballots during the eount.
3. Permitting Mr. Idler to be in the room after the poll was elosed.
4. Permitting policeman No. 560 and other persons to pass through the booth during the election, and
5. General neglect of duty.

I request that the Republican overseer, James Holmes, 1311 Sansom Street, be arrested for general neglect of duty.

I also ask that the former assessor, John L. Lynch, 1625 Moravian Street, be arrested for not being present at the polling place at the date required by law for hearing citizens desiring to have names stricken from the assessor's list.

As a result, I was called before the Court of Common Pleas, No. 3, to state under oath my reasons for not certifying to the election returns and to give evidence of my experienees on election day. The three judges agreed that if I would make affidavit to the facts concerning which I had given evidence, they would transmit my affidavit to the district attorney's offiee.

In this affidavit I mentioned what seemed to the legal advisers of the fusion ticket the most flagrant breach of the law by the election officers; namely, that I, the overseer, had been prevented from interrogating persons claiming the right to vote and that the judge of election had told a man desiring to vote that he need not answer my questions. The affidavit so prepared was presented to the court and sent to the district attorney. It has there remained, so far as I know, to this day.

Such is the experience that a citizen is likely to obtain, if he attempts at the present time to aid in obtaining an honest election in his own division. At the succeeding election I was asked to be a watcher. Was I to blame when I declined on the ground that, if an overseer appointed by the court could be successfully

defied without punishment, it was of no use to waste time acting as a mere watcher with the same triumphant election officers in charge of the polls? Is there any doubt about the large number of fraudulent votes cast at elections, when I know of at least 53 bogus names on the assessor's list in one division in a respectable section of the city? There are over 1,000 divisions in Philadelphia. If we take the illegal voters in mine as an average, there must be at least 53,000 bogus names on the lists.

Philadelphia needs new judges or new election laws or both before it can be freed from a slavery as absolute as that of the southern negro in 1861

[NOTE.—After waiting more than a year and hearing of no action having been taken by the District Attorney to bring the matter before the Grand Jury, I asked Judges Beitler, Audenried and Martin what had become of my affidavit, made at their request, and what I, individually, should do to bring the election officers into court for trial. They politely referred me to the District Attorney's office. An inquiry of similar purport made to Mayor Weaver, who had been the District Attorney at the time, elicited the information that he had no recollection of the matter. Mr. Bell, the District Attorney, who succeeded Mr. Weaver, said that papers relative to the case could not be found in his office. After considerable time had been consumed in this and further correspondence, I was urbanely informed through an assistant of the District Attorney, who was seen by my counsel, that two years had now elapsed and therefore it was too late to find any indictment, even if the papers came to light. See "An Experience of a Republican Citizen of Corrupt and Contented Philadelphia" (with the documents).]